The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

)L. LXXXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1935 NUMBER 1054

Contents

The Week 1

Editorials

Five Minutes for Security 3
A Last Gasp from Versailles 4
Jews Out of Germany 5

General Articles

Facts About Faces: Harry Hopkins....Peggy Bacon 7
Education in the U. S. S. R.....George S. Counts 8
How Come Huey Long?.....Hodding Carter and Gerald L. K. Smith 11
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 16
A Starry Evening (verse).....Marya Zaturenska 17
Other People's Money.....John T. Flynn 17
On the Labor Front.....William P. Mangold 18

Correspondence 19

Particular and General.....Stark Young 21

Books in Review

Letter to England.....Malcolm Cowley 22
Poor Man's Burden.....Mauritz A. Hallgren 23
Who Gets the Aces?.....Horace Taylor 24
The Nature of Armies.....Herman Simpson 24
The Scarecrow Exhumed.....Raymond Leslie Buell 24
Redemption by Sainthood.....Norbert Guterman 25
Handsome Is.....Dorothy Dunbar Bromley 25
Where Novels Grow.....Eric Estorick 26
Books in Brief 27

The Week

THE great scheme to reduce tariff barriers by reciprocal treaties, which began some months ago with Cuba, has now scored a triumph with the addition of Brazil—a nation whose products, like those of Cuba, are largely non-competitive with ours. In the meantime negotiations with other and more important trading nations have been burdened, as the Secretary of State admits, by objections on the part of almost every American producer who makes something that might conceivably compete with a product of the country in question. Similar obstacles of course exist on the other side of the fence. Universal tariff reduction as a way out of the depression is still a long road. And Secretary Hull himself, the great apostle of freer trade, has counter-balanced much of the gain from the new Brazil treaty by simultaneously strengthening the barrier against import of Russian manganese —the Soviet Union being perhaps our best source of supply. Under the most-favored-nation clause, the reduction of duty affecting Brazilian manganese would normally be extended to other nations, but the policy is to deny it to those who are believed to have placed unequal obstacles in the way of our exports. Just why this should apply to the Soviet Union we do not see; in any case, any obstacles are fully as much of our making as of hers. The fact remains that we are poorer by exactly the amount of superior or lower-cost manganese we are thus compelled to forgo.

SEVERAL explanations are being offered for the abrupt termination of the negotiations between the United States and Soviet Russia over debts, loans and trade agreements. 1. It is suggested that the American government turned hostile through fear of Mr. Hearst, who is now conducting an hysterical anti-Russian campaign. 2. It is said that the Japanese have offered to be "reasonable" on naval matters if the United States will go no farther along the road toward close coöperation with the U.S.S.R. 3. It is reported that hostility of the Roman Catholic Church, or of rigidly conservative under-officials of the U. S. State Department, was an important factor. 4. The suggestion is made that France, now closely allied with Soviet Russia, has offered to give her the credits she needs, without raising any embarrassing questions about debts incurred by Kerensky or the Tsar. 5. Germany can provide most of the things Russia might have bought in the United States, and Moscow officials may believe that trade on a large scale diminishes the danger of war, which has become so serious in the past few months.

NONE of these reasons, nor any other we can think of, gives the United States much excuse to feel proud of its share in the outcome. The present Russian government has never borrowed a nickel from the American government, or incurred any private obligations in this country or anywhere else that have not been met on the nail. Our claims against the U.S.S.R. are based on the confiscation of American property after the Revolution. Confiscation is a practice that we ourselves have followed, as when we took without compensation the property in Negro slaves in 1863, and the property in distilleries and breweries during national prohibition. Under normal economic conditions a very large trade is possible between America and Russia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our government, with at least 11,000,000 men out of work, and in the midst of the worst depression in history, has deliberately turned its back on that trade.

THE German government is carrying out its proposals for reducing the degree of autonomy in the individual states. For some reason that is far from clear, the session of the Reichstag that was to have rubber-stamped Hitler's decision was dispensed with, and the new policy was promulgated by decree. In future the Reich will consist of twenty administrative units. These will be ruled by Governors appointed by the Chancellor and responsible only to him. In the cities, control will be completely in the hands of the Nazis. In short, the National Socialist Party, under these new regulations, becomes the German government. All control is firmly vested in the National Cabinet. This is of course only a change in form that confirms an existing reality. It parallels in a striking manner the development some years ago in Italy.

AT THE end of the second year of Hitler's regime, he reviewed in a public proclamation the achievements of that period. He boasted that "more than two-thirds of what I promised has been carried out," although the four-year period for which he asked the country is but half over. What he did not tell Germany is that his government is faced with the necessity of floating a new domestic bond issue of not less than half a billion marks, or that the interest rate on all German mortgage bonds will soon be reduced by an average of 30 percent. Meanwhile, Dr. Schacht, who has now been given a permanent appointment as Minister of Economics, announces "a thoroughgoing reform of our economic activities." State funds must no longer be used to maintain employment. Under no circumstances can wages be increased. The steel and iron industries (which produce the implements of war) will be subsidized by the state, but projects that offer no immediate prospect of return must be discontinued. Dr. Schacht is no economic isolationalist; foreign trade must be developed in order to permit the import of raw materials, lack of which has already crippled some important industries. In other words, Schacht and the industrialists whom he represents are more than ever master of the Reich.

ON Monday of last week most people in Washington believed that the United States Senate was about to accept membership in the World Court. On Tuesday came the news that the resolution had failed to pass. Though it had the substantial majority of 52 to 36, it was seven votes short of the necessary two-thirds. What caused this startling upset? First of all, we are told that the administration forces were overconfident and played their cards badly. Indeed, it is even reported that Mr. Roosevelt himself was lukewarm in the matter, that he submitted the protocol chiefly in order to fulfill a campaign promise and to prevent the propos from being brought up later when it might be use to delay urgent domestic legislation. Far more in portant, however, was opposition to the proposal certain quarters. These included the Hearst new papers, Father Coughlin, Huey Long and Wi Rogers, the radio comedian. Both Father Coug lin and Will Rogers spoke over the radio again the Court on the preceding Sunday night, and c Monday and Tuesday members of the Senate r ceived 40,000 telegrams protesting our entrance a number large enough to frighten a much bra man than the average Senator. Under the circur stances, the marvel is not that the Court was d feated, but that it mustered fifty-two votes.

WHILE we regret the Senate's action, we do nc regard it as a calamity. The Court is far less in portant either for good, as its supporters believe, c for evil, as its opponents fear. The tides that ar sweeping through Europe make the Court eve more negligible than in the past. If it survive we shall have plenty of future opportunity to join There is real cause for alarm, however, in the mear by which the Court was defeated. The campaig conducted by Mr. Hearst and his allies was one c gross misrepresentation, sensationalism and dem gogery. They have demonstrated a power tha could be used and certainly will be used in an effor to influence the country on other and far more im portant matters.

WE FIND on page 13 of the platform anc resolutions adopted unanimously by the Nationa Association of Manufacturers, December 5 and 6, 1934, the following passage:

> The economic foundation of industrial progress is productive efficiency. The attainment of this result requires the harmonious coöperation of labor, management and investors. It demands that employer and employee be free to bargain collectively or individually in such forms as are mutually satisfactory to them, without coercion from any source. . . .
>
> In conformity with these principles: . . . Recognize the equal right of minorities or individuals to bargain for themselves, directly or through representatives of their own selection.

The equal right of minorities or individuals is lost somewhere between pages 13 and 17, however. On page 17 one discovers that the "welfare of industry" demands that

> under appropriate safeguards the approved competitive practices and prohibitions submitted by the properly defined majority of a group, trade or industry should be binding upon the minority. A minority group, in the absence of a majority request, should likewise be authorized to request a code of its own, limited in effect to its own members, and to a period that would automatically terminate when a majority of the industry began to operate under an approved code.

The Chamber of Commerce took a similar stand on minority rights and majority rule in a referendum

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ote of the commercial and trade organizations in s membership. (Reported in The Washington eview for January 7, 1935, p. 7.) It separated e seemingly illogical propositions, not by elegantly lf-filled pages as did the N.A.M., but by the turn f a phrase:

> VII. Rules of fair competition formulated by a clearly preponderant part of an industry as suitable for the whole industry with due consideration for small units and approved by the government agency should be enforceable against all concerns in the industry.
>
> For: 1,724 Against: 153
>
> VIII. In any new legislation it should be made unmistakable that collective bargaining is bargaining with representatives of all groups of employees that desire to act through spokesmen, without the right of a minority group to deal collectively or the direct right of individual bargaining being precluded.
>
> For: 1,822 Against: 67

n advocating the principle of majority rule for ıdustry's codes of fair competition, the Chamber f Commerce and the National Association of Manfacturers recognize that for effective action a roup must act as a unit. Their mistake was in ublishing this recognition.

THE present Food and Drug Act, as everyone nows, is deficient in many particulars. It leaves ıe consumer largely at the mercy of dishonest manfacturers of adulterated or inferior products; it ermits thousands of persons to die every year, and ıany thousands more to suffer impairment of ealth, through reliance upon false and misleading laims of the makers of patent medicines. Last ear, an attempt was made to enact a new bill emedying these conditions and bring the United tates up to the level of most of the civilized coun-ies of the world. This bill was defeated through n active lobby of those persons in the business orld who care nothing for the human misery they ugment, so long as they can get a profit out of it. n the present session of Congress, several new bills ave been introduced that are ostensibly designed to erform the same service as the discarded Copeland ill of last year. None of these bills is much good; ne or two of them are actually vicious. Now, we nderstand, an attempt is being made to rush hrough the enactment of some one of these measres, without public hearings and with a minimum f publicity, for the good reason that even the best f them will not stand scrutiny under the light of lay. We hope that the mere handful of Senators nd Representatives who have some knowledge of his subject and some concern for the public welfare ill be on their guard.

WE REALIZE that there are times in which to xpect the unexpected, especially in anything peraining to economics. Even so, we were hardly preıared for the extraordinary admission made by the Iational City Bank of New York in its November bulletin on economic conditions. The bank points out, quite correctly, that the government, through relief and emergency expenditures, has recently been placing purchasing power directly in the hands of the public at the rate of over four billion dollars annually. The bank is impressed with this figure because it amounts to nearly one-sixth of last year's retail business, which was, according to the Census, $25,750,000,000. "It is a significant fact," observes the bank, "that current business is dependent in such degree upon an arbitrary addition to the purchasing power which arises from the production and exchange of goods within the economic system. It is significant"—and mark these words—"because it shows how far short of supporting itself the economic system still falls." We cannot, of course, disagree with this confession of capitalist collapse; but how did it get into the bulletin of the National City Bank? Someone on the staff of the bulletin must either be boring from within or carrying this bankers'-truce-with-Roosevelt business too far.

Five Minutes for Security

THE EFFORTS of the administration to put through its social-security program unmodified have been high-handed in the extreme. Its first move was to transfer the bill from the Committee on Labor, where the measure belonged, to the Ways and Means Committee, which is more conservative and can be counted upon to present stiffer opposition to federal contributions. This Committee proceeded to hear at length the testimony of those associated with the administration known to be favorable to the provisions as written—an entirely natural and proper proceeding. It took no pains, however, to uncover any adverse opinion, though reports of this were broadcast in the press.

Instead, the Committee imposed a five-minute limitation on succeeding speakers, including highly qualified experts and representatives of groups vitally interested in the project. Some of these, happening to have friends on the Committee, succeeded in obtaining extensions of time. But, in general, the Committee followed the principle, which seems lately to have been gaining headway with the administration, of paying little heed to what representatives of the workers or other opponents on the left had to say. The climax was reached when Herbert Benjamin, of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, was roughly thrown out of the Committee Room. His five minutes had expired; he was unable to finish within the time limit; he could not obtain an extension; and he insisted on trying to get his constituents' case into the news. His forcible ejection from the meeting puts a disgraceful emphasis on the determination of the administration not to hear the opposition. It was bitterly resented by many who do not approve the program of the association that he spoke for. If this sort of thing can happen to a Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munist today, it can happen tomorrow to the president of the A.F. of L., or even to a distinguished scholar.

When the emergency legislation was passed in 1933, the need for haste was obvious, and Congress abandoned its prerogative as a deliberating body in the presence of a crisis. Most of the laws were specifically limited to the emergency. No such need for haste, however, exists in the economic-security program, which is avowedly laying the foundations of a permanent policy. It is desirable that Congress pass a bill during the early part of this session, but the urgency is not so great that those who want to be heard by the Committee may not be given fifteen minutes instead of five, or even, if necessary, an hour or two. Nor is it better to pass an inferior bill next week than a more carefully considered measure a month or two later. The tactics of the administration, which first refused to heed opponents on its own expert staff and now tries to insulate Congress and the public from their opinions as well as from those of other informed critics, strongly suggests that the drive for speed is merely a blind to prevent real consideration of amendments to which it is opposed.

Many who are disappointed in the niggardly character of the measures proposed still feel that after all they are praiseworthy as a beginning and can be improved later. Those who hold this view are naturally not so disturbed at suppression of the opposition. Their opinions are probably justified in the case of old-age pensions and the minor parts of the security program, but it now appears that the present form of the Wagner-Lewis bill for unemployment security is not even a step in the right direction, but constitutes a serious mistake that might take years to retrace.

It is argued in behalf of the bill that it offers an inducement to the states to pass unemployment-insurance measures, and at the same time protects those states that do so from unfair competition in other states, by equalizing the cost to employers. This is supposed to be accomplished by the federal tax of three percent on payrolls, which is to be remitted in states where unemployment-insurance measures are passed. Yet, since the bill contains almost no minimum standards that a state must meet in order to be entitled to the rebate, it would be possible to set up a system under which employers could receive full rebate of the federal three-percent tax and yet contribute only one percent to the unemployment reserve, thus having a two-percent advantage over employers in states collecting the full three percent. A three-percent tax itself would provide inadequate benefits, and under this bill it would be possible to have benefits of no more than three or four dollars a week, to be paid for no more than two weeks, after a long waiting period. Indeed, a positive inducement to do this is offered.

Since no federal standards are set, the way is left open for forty-eight different and conflicting systems, giving rise to limitless confusion and injustices Employees of the same company or workers in th same industry in different states would receive differ ent degrees of protection. A worker would star a good chance of losing all protection if he move from one state to another, on account of the im possibility of coördinating widely different systems

Still further confusion in the administration c the scheme would arise from the various tax systen set up. There is one federal payroll tax for old age annuities, another for unemployment insuranc and an additional state payroll tax for unemploy ment reserves. Thus a great increase in publ administrative costs and in nuisance to the employ ers follows the failure to create a unified federa system. This means leaving less to be paid i benefits.

The bill requires that all funds collected by state for unemployment insurance be turned over to th federal government for investment. Central cor trol of the funds is indeed almost compulsory, grave dangers are to be avoided; nevertheless th provision is in conflict with some state Constitutions It is a clumsy substitute for a single federal system

There are other, minor defects, but those abov cannot be remedied without altering the main prin ciples of the measure. A single federal insuranc plan is clearly indicated. In default of this, a work able though inferior substitute would be a federa levy, to be paid out in subsidies to states establish ing systems that complied with clear and hig standards. This scheme, after the President barre out consideration of a completely federal plan, wa what was recommended both by his own experts an by the outside Advisory Council representing em ployers, welfare organizations and organized labo In its haste to pass the present Wagner-Lewis bil the administration, far from speeding up the estal lishment of a true security program, is threatenin to postpone it for years.

A Last Gasp from Versailles

NEWS DISPATCHES from Europe over th week-end had a strangely familiar sounc Once again France and England were trying t guarantee peace through a system of self-denyin ordinances. Once again, as so often in the pas there were proposals for mutual promises to kee the peace, to join in attacking an aggressor, to gua antee that existing boundaries would be maintaine inviolate. For fifteen years, the Great Powers hav been signing agreements of this sort; for fiftee years, these agreements have gradually faded awa until finally it was again felt necessary to sign ne ones. The process began with the League Covenan and continued with Locarno, the Pact of Paris, th Geneva Agreement of 1932. Is there any hope th the present effort will be more successful than an of the previous ones? Is there anything new i the picture at the present time?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To answer the latter question first, there is one lement that is decidedly new. For many years, ermany has been secretly rearming, in defiance f the Treaty of Versailles. Her military strength is oday estimated to be as great as it was in 1914, and is growing with great rapidity. For a long time, ie French fought desperately to halt this growth, ut they could get no one to help them in the at-empt to use force, obviously the only means by hich Germany could be stopped. At last the house f cards has tumbled in. Germany, having violated ie Treaty, will get away with it. Her right to quality is again recognized, as it was in the compact igned at Versailles. At that time, the Allies prom-sed that they would disarm down to her level—a romise they have grotesquely failed to keep. Now hey agree that Germany is to have that equality vith which she has already provided herself. To e sure, it is equality "only for purposes of negotia-ion." She must agree to reënter the League of Nations, and join a new disarmament conference—till another! Nevertheless, the breach has been ade in the walls. An important section of the reaty is discarded. Who can doubt that this is e beginning of the end?

In another important feature, the new proposals re unlike those that have gone before. The value f the airplane in future warfare has now become obvious that even the thick-headed military men cognize it. The new scheme provides for an "Air ocarno." Great Britain, France, Belgium and ermany would covenant to use their combined air rces against any one of the four of them that ight attack any other of the four. But no one is olish enough to suppose that the Powers would ngage in aerial war without using their armies and vies as well. Indeed, some cynical persons suggest at all France really hoped to get out of the present egotiations was a new and firm military alliance ith Great Britain, following Germany's rejection the plan. It is certainly possible that this may me about; but it is also possible that the itish government will draw back before putting head into the noose; and that, if the first reports e correct and Germany rejects the scheme, the itish will return to the *status quo ante*. If this ould happen, all the bright hopes regarding an stern Locarno and a Central European pact ould probably likewise fade away. The future of ie smaller states is completely bound up with the licies of the five chief Powers—England, France, aly, Germany and Russia. Both their economic d their political fortunes depend upon the attitude se Powers take toward them, and this in turn pends wholly upon what the Powers conceive to their own interests. Justice, the legitimate cul-ral ambitions of racial groups, a normal flow of nomic processes—these are the last things to be sidered. Under such circumstances, a "Locarno" Central or Eastern Europe is a mere case of s in amber—the small states being the flies, the ionalistic policies of the big ones the amber.

The weakness of this proposal is the weakness of all its predecessors: it attempts to bring about peace in Europe without modifying any of the fundamental factors that make for war. Germany under Hitler is still determined to be the dominant power in Central and Eastern Europe; France is still determined to prevent this if it lies within her power to do so. Perhaps it is true that neither of these countries wants war; but certainly, each of them wants things that, in the long run, the other will fight to prevent. There are still two great areas of world danger: the relations between France and Germany, and those between Russia and Japan, and these two are linked together. France and Russia have an understanding that is all but openly admitted to be a military alliance. Disturbing evidence points to the fact that Japan and Germany are working toward a similar end. The tension between Germany and Russia is severe, and has not been diminished by the fact that Poland has now been drawn into the German orbit. Nothing that is proposed in the new agreements, nothing else that any of the governments concerned would be remotely likely to accept, can substantially ameliorate this underlying set of factors that are pushing Europe (and perhaps Asia) toward another war, if not in two years, then in five, if not in five, then in ten.

What we have seen at London in the past two weeks is probably the last gasp of the Versailles system. Some of the arrangements set up in 1919 may continue for a long time to come, simply because it is more dangerous to all concerned to attempt to revise them than to leave them as they stand. But the breakdown of Versailles that is recognized when France concedes that Germany has rearmed, and that nothing can be done about it, turns a page of history. If the next page is not to be one of complete disaster, the rulers of Europe must show an understanding of fundamental forces and an underlying good will such as they have never demonstrated in the past.

Jews Out of Germany

BY MARCH 1, when the Saar returns to German sovereignty, a new army of refugees will be on the march. They will drift to the temporary concentration camps at Toulouse and Bordeaux. For a few uncertain weeks they can stay there and then they must again wander on. Perhaps there will be 10,000 of them, perhaps 30,000; no one knows, except that there are 40,000 refugees from Germany now in the Saar and not many will wish to go back under the regime from which they have already fled.

If the situation of those who are already refugees from Germany were better than it is, the prospect of caring for more would be easier to face. But the situation is far from good. It is described in the report of James G. McDonald, High Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missioner for German refugees, a somber and pessimistic document despite the careful phraseology appropriate to a League of Nations document. In three sentences Mr. McDonald sums up the present situation of these thousands of unfortunates:

> Meantime in many countries the opportunities for the refugees to try to find work and to make themselves secure are being lessened, not enlarged. The governmental restrictive tendency in turn discourages private individuals and organizations in Great Britain and the United States who hitherto have supplied the bulk of the funds for emigration. The remaining refugees therefore are moving in a vicious circle—insecure and not permitted to work where they are, and not enabled to settle elsewhere.

Between the lines of this section of the report it is possible to read something of the situation of the thousands stranded in Paris and Prague—the two chief centers for the refugees—many of them dependent on day-to-day charity for their food, unable, because of the German transfer restrictions, to draw upon their property in Germany, constantly in dread that their temporary residence-permits will not be renewed. It is scarcely remarkable that thousands within Germany, Jews and Christians alike, have abandoned all hope of emigration, preferring to bear their present woes within Germany—and they still are woes—rather than face the unknown prospects of semi-starvation and insecurity abroad.

The various governments have taken an attitude of moral superiority toward Germany in this matter, but they themselves have been none too coöperative. Rarely have they reduced their requirements for "papers" and visas—when the price of a visa may be more than the total wealth of a refugee—and they have been reluctant to permit the refugees the certainty of even a few months' residence. Mr. McDonald, for example, pleads that temporary permits be issued for six-month periods. If he considers six months the longest period for which he dare ask, one can realize the constant insecurity in which the refugees must live.

Fortunately the situation is not everywhere so black. Some 22,000 refugees have been permanently settled outside of Europe, 12,000 in South America, and nearly 10,000 more in Palestine. A few thousands have been given permanent residences in European countries, but the prospects for future settlement, except in Palestine, are dubious. Even in countries where arrangements have been made for retraining the emigrants in new occupations or for their permanent settlement in Jewish colonies, the time during which they may stay and the number allowed to settle permanently are both sharply limited. Denmark has agreed to place a number of refugees on farms in order to give them an agricultural training, but they must agree to leave the country after a year. Holland has set aside a small village in the lands reclaimed from the Zuyder Zee, but the number who can live there is small. Reports from Europe indicate that even the Jewish communities in the countries surrounding Germany hav looked askance at a flood of their coreligionists They have been generous with their money, but i the present worldwide restriction of economi opportunity no one welcomes an influx of compet tion. Nor does anyone welcome an indefinite con tinuance of the present method of caring for th refugees by private charity. So far, neither th League nor any member nation has arranged to us its own funds and the current French proposal be fore the League to appropriate League money fo this purpose is thought in Europe to be a politica gesture with little chance of passage.

The situation of professional people among th refugees is scarcely better, although their case ha been given greater publicity and as a class they ar generally subject to less restriction of movement o residence than manual workers. Mr. McDonald estimates that some 4,500 professional men an women, teachers, technicians and students, have lef Germany, but that of this number less than 2,00 have found permanent posts, a number of them oddly enough, in Turkey, where the government i seeking to establish a modern educational system Although many of these professional people are dis tinguished scholars and eminent experts in thei fields, it is difficult to fit them into academic an professional circles in other countries. Universit and research budgets are strictly limited in thes days and to give a post to a German scholar usual means that the native scholars have to make up h salary by reductions in their own. As Professo Norbert Wiener cogently points out in an articl in The Jewish Advocate, this is not a method o helping German refugees but of spreading ant foreignism and anti-Semitism. The remedy is e larged endowments (though Dr. Alvin Johnson ha done a notable piece of work with limited funds a the New School for Social Research, New Yor City), and those who would like at one stroke t aid the refugees and advance learning could do r better than back The Jewish Advocate's campaig to establish endowed chairs at American universiti for these emigré scholars.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOV. T
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Facts About Faces: IV. *Harry Hopkins*

Small sensible head, quiet forehead, deepset lugubrious eyes cocked cagily under little sardonic eyebrows. (Can't-put-that-over-on-me.) Long ruminating nose, hitched to two deep dissimilar grooves, struggling from nostrils around lips to chin. Mouth twisted, wary, speculative, expressing distrust and dubiety—strain and seriousness battling profound indifference. Attitude shrinkingly solitary, secretively sucking in cheeks and chewing his lips—neutrality crouched on the fence, feline style, glancing circumspectly to the right and left. Drab coloring and an air of dismal youth. Pale urban-American type, emanating an aura of chilly cynicism and defeatist irony like a moony, melancholy newsboy selling papers on a cold night.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Education in the U.S.S.R.

JUST ONE year ago I received a two-thousand-word letter from the students of a pedagogical technicum in Moscow—an institution devoted to the training of teachers for the primary grades and corresponding in function to an American normal school. This letter had been prepared under instructions by a committee and then approved in general meeting by the entire student body, composed of five hundred young men and woman. It was addressed to me in the hope that I would pass it on to a group of American students interested in starting correspondence.

The letter describes in some detail the purpose and program of the technicum—course of study, methods of instruction, student activities, living and working conditions and the relation of the institution to the building of socialism. Then, in order to leave no room for misunderstanding about the life of the Soviet student, the letter proceeds to sketch the case of an actual student in the technicum, "Comrade" Klishin by name, giving her age, her parentage, her scholastic preparation, her room number in the dormitory, the amount of her monthly stipend from the state, the charge for her living quarters, the cost of her meals, the items on her bill of fare, her amusements and recreations, her rights and privileges under the labor code and other interesting bits of information. The account closes with these words: "After graduating from the technicum, Comrade Klishin has no fear of unemployment or of being thrown out upon the noisy streets of the town. On the contrary, there will open up before her the bright life of a teacher of the polytechnical school full of exploits." On many occasions I have read this letter to groups of American teachers. Invariably, on hearing the passage just quoted, they have laughed. The very thought that the life of an elementary-school teacher might be bright and full of exploits appeared to them humorous.

This letter alone, if examined in its entirety, would be sufficient to arouse interest in the Soviet educational system and make it seem worthy of study by students of education in the United States. Such a conclusion, moreover, is supported by innumerable more or less competent reports that have come out of Russia during the past decade. All informed persons know that the October Revolution of 1917 has led to the development of an educational system radically unlike that to be found in any other country—a development that, in the long view of history, may be far more significant than those more dramatic and sensational aspects of the Revolution that have been stressed in the daily press and even in more serious publications. Certainly, whatever may be one's attitude toward the communist state now emerging beyond the Polish border, one cannot leave out of the appraisal the system of educational institutions.

Unfortunately the accounts of Soviet education to be found in the English language are utterly inadequate to give the American reader a clear picture of what has happened under Bolshevik rule. Most of them deal in generalities and are weak on detail. Moreover, the situation in the Soviet Union is so dynamic that by the time a book is published it is likely to be somewhat out of date. In the past five years the system of education has been profoundly altered. Consequently the only really satisfactory way of studying Soviet education is to take a trip to the Soviet Union. The next best thing is to bring samples of Soviet education to the United States. And this has been done extremely well by the Exhibition of Education in the Soviet Union, which was prepared by various Soviet agencies and is now on display at the American Museum of Natural History under the auspices of the American Russian Institute.[1]

This exhibition comes to the United States in response to an exhibition of American education that was sent to the Soviet Union in 1930 and was displayed in Leningrad during the summer. It has surpassed its American predecessor, however, both in scope and general excellence. Although it lacks some of those striking qualities that have come to be associated with Soviet exhibits, it does show the expected mastery of the art of representation. An enormous amount of labor, pains and ingenuity has gone into it. The result is an exhibit from which any honest inquirer, willing to give the necessary time and thought, can gain a fairly good grasp of both the philosophy and the practice of Soviet education. Also it should prove interesting and instructive to the ordinary citizen who wishes merely to learn more about what is going on in the world.

The size of the exhibit is a bit overwhelming. When it is packed for shipment it takes up 900 cubic feet; when it is on display it covers 15,168 square feet of floor space. It includes no less than 137 panels of drawings, diagrams, charts, models, paintings and photographs, 9 cases of games, toys, books, magazines, models and albums, besides a considerable quantity of supplementary materials representing the creative and social activities of Soviet children. The subjects embraced include the general organization of education, pre-school institutions, primary and secondary education, extra-curriculum activities of children,

[1] This exhibit will be on display daily at the Museum until February 22. The hours are 9:00 to 5:00 week days and 1:00 to 5:00 on Sundays.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living and working conditions of teachers, cultural work among adults, training in the arts and the cultural development of national minorities. In spite of its scope, however, the exhibit does not give a complete picture of Soviet education. Thus it includes next to nothing on the program of vocational, professional and higher education; it makes only the barest reference to the vast network of research institutes that has spread over the Union during the past seven years; and it has very little to say about innumerable cultural agencies that are designed to reach the adult population. Therefore the visitor to the exhibit should note that it is confined for the most part to those divisions of the Soviet program that have to do with the education of children.

Perhaps the first impression that the exhibit makes upon the observer is one of the sheer magnitude of the development of education in the Soviet Union. Charts, diagrams and tables suggest that every phase of education has grown with extraordinary rapidity during recent years. Illiteracy, which probably amounted to almost 70 percent in 1917, has been all but wiped out; the number of youngsters served by pre-school institutions, which scarcely existed at the time of the Revolution, reached almost nine millions in 1933; the enrolment in primary and secondary schools has increased from less than eight millions in 1915 to more than twenty-five millions in 1933; and the attendance at higher technical schools and universities has grown during this same period from about fifty thousand to five hundred thousand. Also in 1933 there were approximately eight hundred thousand students in the lower technical schools of the Union. The growth of scientific-research institutes has been even more remarkable. Between 1929 and 1933 the number of such institutes grew from 441 to 1,243 and the number of persons working in them from 22,600 to 53,000.

Equally impressive has been the expansion of various non-scholastic educational and cultural agencies. From 1913 to 1933 the number of titles of books printed increased from 28,132 to 49,880 and the number of copies from 113,400,000 to 518,319,000. At the same time the number of newspapers advanced from 859 to 6,674 and total circulation from 2,729,000 to 35,500,000. Figures of similar import might be given for magazines, libraries, theatres, moving pictures, radio, telephone, telegraph, post and travel.

These statistics of course may be subject to considerable discount. There may be some actual padding of figures; many of the teachers and scientific workers must be poorly trained; much of the instruction is consequently of a relatively inferior grade; and the entire cultural apparatus has undoubtedly been pervaded by a shallow form of propaganda of the moment. Yet when all the necessary qualifications have been made, the fact remains that at least on the quantitative side the development of education in the Soviet Union during the past seventeen years is without parallel in history. A psychological ferment has been started that already has profoundly disturbed and transformed the mentality of a population of one hundred and sixty millions. People have been taught to read; men and women have been told to hope; ideas have been disseminated on an unprecedented scale. Forces have been released that can never be controlled.

The student of Soviet education, however, would make a mistake if he should assume that this extraordinary development can be understood in purely quantitative terms. Superficially it may appear that this development has merely involved the introduction into a culturally backward country of institutions already existing in the other part of the world. Such, however, is not the case. While the experience of other people has been generously and systematically drawn upon, the result is a unique system of educational institutions—a system that is still in its early stages and that may be expected to change greatly during the next twenty-five years. So intimately has it been involved in the course of the Revolution itself that any effort to interpret it apart from political and social forces is certain to result in misunderstanding.

An excellent illustration of such misunderstanding is to be found in the controversy that has been carried on for some time between progressive and conservative educators in America over changes in Soviet educational policy. Each group has claimed at one time or another that Soviet experience has supported its position. Thus the progressives have maintained that immediately following the Revolution, Soviet educators examined the educational practices of the world and decided in their favor, introducing the Dalton method, the project method, free activity on the part of children, pupil government in an extreme form, and so on. The conservatives, while originally discounting this apparent triumph of progressive ideas in Russia, have more recently agreed that these ideas were weighed in the Soviet scales in the nineteen-twenties, as their opponents had maintained, but were found wanting. In support of their argument they point to the resolution of September, 1931, and to subsequent resolutions of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, which seemed to mark the deliberate abandonment of progressive methods all along the line and the restoration of discipline and authority in the school. As a matter of fact Soviet education, if examined fundamentally, is farther removed today from education in capitalistic countries, whether progressive or conservative, than at any other time since the Bolsheviks rose to power.

From the beginning Soviet education has had one all-pervasive and dominant aim—that of serving the revolutionary forces and of building a socialist state along the lines laid down by the Party. In an open letter published in Izvestia on September 11, 1933, a letter which in the parts here quoted might have been published on November 7, 1917,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Commissar of Education of the Russian Republic stated that the system of cultural institutions was "directed toward the conversion of the entire laboring population of the country into self-conscious and active builders of a classless socialistic state." Changes in Soviet education have come partly from actual pedagogical experience but chiefly from the progress and fortunes of the program of socialistic construction.

From this standpoint the history of Soviet education can be divided into two periods. The first covers the years from 1917 to 1928 or 1929, the second from 1928 or 1929 to the present. During the first period the revolutionary forces were engaged primarily in clearing the country of enemies, in consolidating their position politically, in gaining control of and organizing cultural agencies, in preparing the population psychologically for the new dispensation to appear some time in the future. To a degree these were years of uncertainty and experimentation in education as well as in other fields. But the elevation of the pupil and the corresponding reduction of the authority of the teacher were measures designed chiefly to enable the Communists to gain control of the schools. In essence they were political measures.

All students of the Revolution are familiar with the struggle that was carried on for years between the Party and the intellectual classes. The Bolshevik leaders were quick to see that it might be much easier to capture students than teachers, particularly when they could change the social composition of the student body and introduce into the schools actual Communist organizations of children and youth—the Pioneers and Komsomols. In addition the point should be made that during this period the tasks of the school were not clear, beyond inculcating in the rising generation the fundamental ideas of communism. The latter of course the school did and did very effectively, in spite of all the freedom that progressive educators from America thought they saw in Soviet education.

The second period was ushered in by the First Five Year Plan—a period dominated by a gigantic program of socialist construction. The resolutions already referred to registered the changes thrust upon educational institutions by events. No longer could the work of the school be judged in terms of the mere inculcation of communist ideas. Far more was demanded. The First Five Year Plan called for hundreds of thousands of technically trained persons and for an entire population equipped with the specific knowledges and skills required in the building of factories and mills, the operation of machine industry and the modernization of agriculture. Mastery of technique became the slogan everywhere. The epoch of romanticism had given way to an epoch of realism. Also the old struggle with the intellectual classes was drawing to a close, largely because those classes had been reconstituted and enlarged. The restoration of authority to the teacher was consequently a political as well as a pedagogical matter. It recorded the end of the Revolution in one of its phases.

In the realm of technical and higher education a veritable convulsion took place during these years. The burden placed upon this division of the system was multiplied overnight. Excuses were not accepted by the authorities; administrators cracked under the strain; personnel changed rapidly. Old programs and institutions were subjected to rigorous scrutiny; new programs and institutions were fashioned to meet the needs. Universities were literally taken to pieces, and the pieces reassembled in new and strange configurations. The control of all forms of technical and professional training, with few exceptions, was removed from the Commissariat of Education, where it is generally found in capitalistic countries, and placed under the commissariats responsible for the administration of the corresponding branches of the economy. The result is a form of educational organization and an integration of training with life not to be found elsewhere. It is a distinctively socialistic solution to the problem.

During this second period primary and secondary education has also undergone profound changes. Emphasis on communistic sectarianism has abated somewhat; objectives have been made more definite and practical; and attention to the acquisition of specific knowledge and skill has been increased. Yet more significant, however, is the development of the conception of polytechnical education, a term now applied to the entire program of the primary and secondary schools. This conception, moreover, represents a clear application of socialistic principles to the problem of general education. Also it occupies the center of the stage in the exhibit.

Polytechnical education in the Soviet Union may be traced back to the first years of the Revolution, and even to the writings of Marx and Engels. As soon as the Bolsheviks took over the schools, they insisted that labor be made the basis of the educational program as it was to be made the basis of the socialist state. The result was a great deal of experimentation and the emergence of the concept of socially useful labor as the foundation of the school program—labor useful to the surrounding community performed by children and teachers. With the launching of social and economic planning on a large scale, this concept took more definite form and evolved into the idea of polytechnical education.

The underlying principle of this conception of education is that the program of the school should be organized about the productive forces of society. But there are many branches of production. Which are to be regarded as most fundamental and therefore appropriate to form the focal point of educational endeavor? The Soviet leaders have selected the following four: the production of electrical energy, machine production and its electrification,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chemical production and its electrification, and agricultural production. All Soviet children are made acquainted with these branches of production through a more or less systematic introduction to the principal tools and appliances employed, the qualities of the more important materials used, the primary processes of manual and mechanized labor and the foundations of the scientific management and planning of production. Theoretical instruction is related to practical reality by actual work on the part of children in the shops and land plots of the school and in associated factories, mills, shops, collective farms and motor-tractor stations. All of this is designed, of course, to give understanding and to mold social outlook rather than to develop vocational proficiency. As a consequence the program of the lower schools is quite as closely related to life as that of the institutions of higher education.

The foregoing is not intended as a systematic exposition of Soviet educational theory and practice. On the contrary, it is purposely highly selective and partial, leaving out of the picture many things of importance. It is not even a description of the exhibit, as anyone who has visited it can readily see. It is rather an attempt to introduce the American visitor to the exhibit by directing his attention to certain fundamental conceptions and considerations that are more or less foreign to his mode of thought. And when he does stand in the presence of the 137 panels, and reads their sometimes rather quaint English captions, he should remember that things are not always what they seem. The Soviet educational program rests upon social conceptions that may be as foreign to him as the Russian language.

GEORGE S. COUNTS.

How Come Huey Long?

We present below two widely varying views of Huey Long and his Share Our Wealth movement. Mr. Carter, who writes the first article, is an independent observer whose general position, it will be seen, is unfavorable. Mr. Smith, whose activities in support of Long are described by Mr. Carter, writes as a convinced and enthusiastic disciple. The New Republic accepts no responsibility for Mr. Smith's views and gives them no endorsement. We publish his article for its value in revealing just how much of a case it is possible to make for Senator Long, and because it helps to explain the extraordinary speed with which his movement is at present growing. The articles, we should add, were written independently of each other.—THE EDITORS.

1. Bogeyman—

UNDER the spreading loblolly pine tree, the village skeptic stands pretty much alone, and very quiet in his skepticism. Apart from him, his fellow villagers and their country kinsmen loll and listen. The Louisiana sun beats down impartially upon them and upon the red-faced, stentorian-voiced exhorter, whose blue shirt is soaked with perspiration. His flailing, prophetically extended arms are raised in benediction, with swift detour to wipe the sweat from his face. His voice, amplified through the loudspeaker on the sound truck, trembles with histrionic emotion.

"All of you that ain't got *four* suits of clothes, raise your hands," he bellows.

Five hundred pairs of arms shoot skyward.

"I thought so—I thought so, brethren. Now all of you that ain't got *three* suits of clothes, raise your hands."

Again a thousand arms reach to the sky.

"Just like I knew, brethren. Oh, blessed are the poor, but what a row they have to hoe. Now all of you that ain't got *two* suits of clothes, raise your hands."

For the third time, the arms reach convulsively, almost triumphantly into the air.

"Not even *two* suits of clothes. Oh, my brethren, J. P. Morgan has two suits of clothes. He has a hundred times two suits of clothes. And that ain't all. Now all of you all that ain't got even *one* suit of clothes—one single suit of clothes that the pants match the coat—raise your hands."

Once more the thousand hands are raised, and a shout almost like a thanksgiving comes from the mass of suitless listeners who are living in the word-paradise and under the paralyzing dictatorship of Huey P. Long.

The coat-and-pants speaker is Gerald L. K. Smith—the Reverend Gerald L. K. Smith—high priest and prophet of Senator Long's Share Our Wealth movement. When he concludes his two-hour speech against Wall Street and the assorted opponents of Huey Long, there will be five hundred new members of the society. Five hundred gaunt, grinning farmers and small-town ne'er-do-wells will file beside the sound truck and sign the cards that automatically make them members of the National Share Our Wealth Society of Huey Long.

Huey has more than Wall Street on the run in Louisiana, and the legislative travesties by which he has accomplished his complete dictatorship are costing a pretty penny, though not at the direct expense of his fellow wealth-sharers; for theirs is not the eventual day of reckoning in a state where business is terrorized and where the public debt of nearly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$150,000,000 is the third greatest in the union. Huey Long is now the sole dispenser of boons and headaches in the Louisiana duchy. For a righteous Share Our Wealth member, things are rosy. Huey has reduced the automobile licenses, especially for farmers. He has ordained a two-thousand-dollar homestead exemption, provided, of course, that other taxes bring in revenue to keep the machine wheels greased. He has granted a two-year debt moratorium—federal obligations excluded—and as judges of whether individual moratoria should be granted he has appointed loyal legislators in direct opposition to the state Constitution. The one-dollar poll tax is a thing of the past. Add all that to paved roads, free schoolbooks and a continual taxation harrying of the Standard Oil and the public utilities, with imminent though yet unrealized rate reductions, and you get a pretty good idea of why the doctrine of wealth sharing has taken hold among the poor whites, who constitute the majority of Louisiana's electorate.

Through such benefactions, Huey claims to have "Mr. Roosevelt's depression" on the run in Louisiana. He has managed to obtain such powers as were never before won by any politician in the United States. For, at the present time, Huey Long has sole control of fixing assessments in the state. He can decide, through his own state bar association, created by the legislature, who shall and who shall not be a practising member of the Louisiana bar. Through an ironically named Civil Service Commission, he can remove, and already has removed, elected or appointed officials of political subdivisions of the state, both municipal and parish. The State Supreme Court, his by a consistent four-to-three margin, can legalize anything he has enacted, and his secret state police force, its identity and numbers known only to the administration, can take you out of your home whenever it likes and hold you incommunicado on whatever charge may be necessary.

To the taxpaying and articulate opposition, all this has a decidedly unpleasant sound. But there's nothing to be done about it, unless the federal government's actions for income-tax evasion eventually include Huey along with his four right-hand bowers now under indictment, and unless such indictments result in blanket convictions. Federal interference, plus a newly formed and partly secret Square Deal Association, is about the only significant and tangible menace to the continued reign of the Kingfish.

Asked to define the difference between misery and poverty, a Louisiana college student once answered that "misery was when you had a pain and poverty was when you didn't have anything." He thus effected a very definite split between these two afflictions. According to this definition, the Share Our Wealth plan does much the same thing with misery and poverty. It deftly inflicts misery upon the political scoffers in the rural bailiwicks and makes of poverty a rallying point, political and economic, about which Huey Long can work toward a national goal that is by no means so hazy as are his wealth-sharing nostrums for making everybody prosperous.

For although the Share Our Wealth program is excessively simple, its simplicity does not imply clarity. There are two focal objectives. One is to "give every man, woman and child in the United States five thousand dollars," with a home, a job, a radio and an automobile to boot for every family. The other is to prohibit great fortunes by restricting the amount of money any man may have or bequeath. The manner in which the second objective can be attained is obvious. Huey has never been averse to excessive taxation so long as the tax is not placed directly upon the rural and small-town voter. But he has not made clear the manner in which he will obtain the five thousand dollars a head. A graduated, confiscatory tax on the rich will do it, he says. Statisticians say otherwise. Yet the probable method is not a cause for worry among his disciples.

The organization of a Share Our Wealth club is as pleasingly effortless as its promised benefits. A prospective member has only to obtain, free of charge, a membership card, following one of the Reverend Gerald's rousing meetings. There are no dues-strings attached, no matter what the newspapers say. Blazoned across the card is the caption "Share Our Wealth Society—Every Man a King." One merely has to fill in one's name, or have one's friend oblige in case the ability to write is lacking as it often is, and one's address, age and the names and addresses of other prospective members. And just think—this card will be filed in Senator Huey Long's offices in Washington, D. C! We'll be on the inside track when the great day arrives. Moreover, each member has the opportunity of being president or secretary of a Share Our Wealth club. There are no treasurers, as yet. These high offices can be attained through persuading two or three others in one's neighborhood to fill out cards and send them to Washington. By getting these members, a man can become president of the club thus formed, for as Brother Smith opines, a Share Our Wealth club has much of the Biblical in it: "Wherever two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Besides, says Huey, the Gideons had but two men when they organized, and "Three Tailors of Tooley Street drew the Magna Carta of England."

On Sundays and holidays the members can hold Share Our Wealth parades, with American flags and slightly contradictory banners bearing the slogan "Every Man a King." The presidents of the neighborhood locals can vie with each other in making speeches that are earnest if imperfect replicas of Reverend Smith's evangelistic pronouncements or Huey's signed messages in his roaring weekly, The American Progress. In between times, they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

n improve the shining hour by reading, learning id inwardly digesting the countless Progress tories describing the horrors of the concentration of wealth. Also, when one of the many Louisiana elections for everything from coroner to Governor comes up, they can satisfy themselves by questioning the candidates as to their opinions on the Share Our Wealth program. The independent or anti-Long candidate in the country precincts thus can be placed in a distressing dilemma. If he is so foolhardy as to answer "poppycock" he can kiss a large and solid block of votes goodbye. If he endorses the plan, grudgingly or even enthusiastically, he is still viewed with skepticism, for an alert wealth-sharer will point out that since he is fighting Huey, his wealth-sharing support is only a vote-getting scheme—why, he's a demagogue, that's what he is.

Undoubtedly, the Share Our Wealth program is the most brilliantly conceived of all of Huey Long's many political brain children. Its appeal is unanswerable on the stump. Its clever employment of truth and half-truth as a foundation for its promises of plenty for the poor and its criticism of unrestricted wealth for the wealthy make the odds pretty high against the supporters of things-as-they-are, or even the sincere but less munificent economic trail blazers. No one questions Brother Smith's declaration that millions are unemployed, near starvation and dependent on New Deal doles. There is no rebuttal to his statement that America is a land of plenty, with enough supplies to feed, goods to clothe and building materials to house in comfort every man, woman and child. Though his figures may be a few billions out of the way, no one denies that a tremendous amount of the nation's wealth is in the hands of a few, while the many "ain't got even one suit of clothes."

Of course, there is nothing new in the human fundamentals to which Huey and the Reverend appeal, or in the economic reforms they advocate. Class consciousness, envy of wealth and a desire for the creature comforts of life are strong in the United States today, as they have been strong in every nation in every age. This is especially true of the poor whites of the South, those near-disenfranchised, lethargic and doomed relics of a ruinous agricultural system. Old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, a balance of supply and demand, wealth spread—these have been the war cries of modern economists long before the New Deal was supposed to begin its attack on Big Business. But where the student of economics presents his suggestions through an impersonal, systematic theory, whose appeal is primarily to the rational, Huey and his high priest strike home to the emotions, the hates and the desires, the superstitions of the underprivileged poor-white class.

Reverend Smith, who, next to Huey Long and Mississippi's Bilbo, is probably the most talented rabble rouser in the South, can in an instant switch his mighty voice from piteously picturing Christ on the Cross to calling the local anti-Long leaders a "bunch of dirty, thieving drunkards." Escorted by force from one parish by a determined group of anti-administrationists, with the heeded warning not to turn up again, he bobs up in the next parish with a vitriolic attack on his "persecutors" and proceeds upon his Christian way, describing the wife of a former Governor, who fought Long until her recent death, as "two jumps ahead of the insane asylum," and calling upon any hostile member in the crowd to "shoot me while I stand here helpless," his arms outstretched as though pinned to a cross and his sound truck surrounded by vigilant state police in plainclothes and uniform.

Reverend Smith has not confined his political and economic proselyting to Louisiana alone. He has gone into Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, preaching Share Our Wealth and organizing societies. Weekly The American Progress reports thousands of new members. Huey and the Reverend Smith claim that there are now five million members in the United States. Divide this assertion by five or ten, and you still have a sizable—and in Louisiana a distinctly militant—group of zealots. The American Progress keeps hammering away at concentrated wealth, the chain stores, the national administration and the assorted opposition to Huey's rule in Louisiana. Under senatorial frank, Huey floods the nation with similar masterpieces, whose literary and ethical level is but slightly higher than those that The Progress presents for fifty cents a year—and don't bother about paying, we deduct printing expenses from the payrolls. Every person in the United States who can read, and many who can't, know at least vaguely who Huey Long is and what he is driving at.

"Wall Street and its newspapers, and the radio liars say this is a scheme to make money for your friend, Huey Long," shouts Reverend Smith. "They'd kill him if they could, my brethren. And they're going to have to kill him to keep him from helping you. As God is my judge, the only way they will keep Huey Long from the White House is to kill him. But when they do, his great work will go marching on. Share, brothers, share, and don't let those white-livered skunks laugh at you."

Huey Long in the White House. A preposterous belly-laugh. An impossible irony of Democracy. But not to these people. Four years ago Louisiana was plastered with signs, "The White House in 1940." Huey hasn't discouraged such statements. They like him in Arkansas, as Mrs. Caraway can attest. They like him and his ilk in Mississippi, which has just presented Bilbo to the Senate. Whether or not the stars continue to fall on Alabama, the rednecks will worship the man who can outrant and outsmart a Graves or a Heflin. They flocked to listen to him in the Dakotas when he stumped for Roosevelt.

Despite his assertions and attacks upon the present administration, it cannot be predicted that Huey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Long will run for President in 1936. Certainly, it cannot now be foreseen that he would have an outside chance for election. But if the electoral college is abolished and the depression isn't, stranger political disasters could befall a tragically ignorant people groping for surety.

HODDING CARTER.

2. Or Superman?

NINE YEARS ago, Louisiana was a feudal state. Until that time it was ruled by the feudal lords in New Orleans and on the big plantations: the cotton kings, lumber kings, rice kings, oil kings, sugar kings, molasses kings, banana kings, etc. The state was just a "mainland" of the territory. The common people in New Orleans were ruled, domineered over and bulldozed by a political organization known as the Old Regulars. The great mass of people in the city and the country worked like slaves or else lived in an isolation that excluded opportunity. Labor unions were very weak and the assembly of workers was prohibited in most industrial centers. It was not uncommon for labor organizers to be beaten or assassinated.

The great corporations ruled the state and pushed the tax burden onto the poor. The Chambers of Commerce spent money in the North urging industry to come South for cheap labor. Illiteracy was as common as peonage. The commissary plan was in force in mills and on plantations; it kept the workers from receiving cash and left them always in debt to the employer. The highway system was a series of muddy lanes with antique ferries and narrow bridges with high toll charges. Great forests sold for a dollar an acre, to be "slaughtered" and removed with nothing left to enrich the lives of stranded cut-over population. Families north of New Orleans were forced to pay an $8 toll to cross Lake Pontchartrain into New Orleans and return.

Of course, we had our grand and glorious aristocracy, plantation mansions, the annual Mardi Gras festival, horse races, and those staunch defenders of the old South, the newspapers. Of course, the old Louisiana aristocracy, with its lords, dukes and duchesses, had to be preserved, regardless of what happened to the people. State institutions constituted a disgrace. The insane were strapped, put into stocks and beaten. The penitentiary was an abyss of misery, hunger and graft. The State University had 1,500 students with a "C" rating. Most of the young people were too poor to attend Tulane, the only big university in the state. Ten thousand aristocrats ruled the state while 2,000,000 common people wallowed in slavery with no representation in the affairs of the state. Half of the children were not in school. Great sections of the adult population could not read or write. Little consideration was given to Negro education. Professional training was available only to the sons of the privileged.

Huey Long grew up in the pine woods of Winn Parish. He had witnessed the sale of trees worth $10 each for $1 an acre. He was sensitive to injustice. He knew the difficulty of receiving a higher education. He seemed to have an intuitive appreciation of ideal social conditions. At the age of twenty, his Share the Wealth ideal was fixed in his mind. Shortly after, he announced his ambition to become Governor. He was ridiculed, patronized and pitied. True enough, he was a mustang—rough, wild, vigorous, and at the same time mysteriously intelligent. At thirty, he was the best lawyer in Louisiana. He had the surface manners of a demagogue, but the depth of a statesman. This dual nature accounts for many of his victories. He wins like a demagogue and delivers like a statesman. His capacity for work was unlimited. He waded through mud, drove along dusty highways, and soon became the poor man's best friend. After fifteen hours of hard work, he could recover completely with three hours of sleep. He recognized the value of entertainment in leading these sad, enslaved people out of bondage. He is Louisiana's greatest humorist. It was his wedge, but behind that wedge was a deep sympathy and a tender understanding of the needs of his people.

In 1928 he was elected Governor. He had promised many things that even his staunchest admirers questioned his ability to deliver. He moved to Baton Rouge, tore down the old Governor's mansion, built a new one, built a new capitol, built new university buildings, refused to entertain socially, attended no banquets, snubbed the elite and opened the mansion to the muddy feet of his comrades. He offended the sensibilities of the tender sons and daughters of privilege. He whipped bankers into line, he struck blow after blow at peonage, he gave orders to the Standard Oil Company, the bank trust and the feudal lords. Society matrons, lottery kings, gamblers, exclusive clubs and—not to be forgotten—leading clergymen with sensitive flocks joined hands to impeach this "wild," "horrible," "terrible," "bad" man. The war was on. Impeachment proceedings failed. State senators, representatives and appointees began to obey like humble servants—not in fear, but quite as anxious parents obey a great physician who prescribes for a sick child. He was recognized by friend and foe as the smartest man in Louisiana.

Severance taxes were levied on oil, gas, lumber and other natural resources, which made possible free schoolbooks for all children, black and white, rich and poor, in public and private schools. Telephone rates were cut, gas rates were cut, electric rates were cut; night schools were opened up and 149,000 adults were taught to read and write. Then came free ferries, new free bridges, 5,000 miles of paved and improved roads (six years ago, we had only seventeen miles of pavement in Louisiana); a free medical school was built, as fine as any in the country. Free school buses were introduced, the assembly of workers for organization was guar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anteed, new advantages were created for the deaf, the blind, the widows, the orphans and the insane, the penitentiary was modernized, traveling libraries were introduced and improved highways were forced through impassable swamps. Recently poll taxes were abolished, giving the franchise to 300,000 who had never voted. Legislation has been passed, removing all small homes and farms from the tax roll. This means that 95 percent of the Negro population will pay no taxes and 70 percent of the total population will be tax free. This transfers the tax burden from the worker to those who profit by his labor.

This was not easy to accomplish. Numerous attempts have been made to assassinate Huey Long, vigorous plots have been made to assassinate his character. These plotters have at all times enjoyed the coöperation of the Louisiana newspapers. We who hold mass meetings in the interest of our movement are threatened, guns are drawn on us and every conceivable hazard is put in our way by hirelings. Prior to the last legislature, when word was received that the tax burden was to be completely shifted from the little man to the big man, the newspapers actually appealed to and encouraged violence. They promoted mass meetings in the state capital and encouraged armed men to come to Baton Rouge, and expressed the implied hope that Huey Long would be killed. Although these meetings had the support of the combined press of the state, they fell flat in the presence of the sincerity of Governor Allen and Senator Long. The moratorium bill protected homes and farms and personal property against sheriff sales.

In the midst of all this, Huey Long was elected to the United States Senate, and began to preach in Washington what he had been practising in Louisiana. He made the first real speech and introduced the first real bill for the actual redistribution of wealth.

On February 3, 1934, he founded the Share Our Wealth Society and called on the American people to organize in order to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Limitation of poverty to a minimum of a $5,000 family estate.
2. Limitation of wealth to a maximum of $10,000,000.
3. Free higher education for all, with a mental test instead of the tuition test. If men in the army can be fed, boarded and clothed while we teach them how to kill, we can do as much for our best minds while they are being trained to live.
4. Employment for all by the shortening of hours.
5. Full compensation for veterans.
6. Old-age pensions.
7. Great national development programs to absorb the unemployed.

This program of work was strengthened by Senator Long's activity in connection with bank legislation, the Frazier-Lempke farm moratorium bill and numerous other pieces of legislation favorable to veterans and workers.

Our newspapers have given out the report that Senator Long is our dictator. The fact of the case is that the power to govern in Louisiana has been transferred from the feudal lords and their servile newspapers to the common people who elected a man to lead them and are standing by him. At the close of the Legislature this summer, long stories were written about Huey Long's puppet Governor and Legislature. The facts are these: At the close of the Legislature, the program was submitted to the people for a referendum and by a vote of 7 to 1 every major thing accomplished by the Legislature was approved.

Demagogues do not decide to educate their people. They thrive on ignorance. They may promise the same things that Huey Long promises, but they never deliver them. He keeps all of his campaign promises. We, who follow him, adore him and consider ourselves flattered when he asks our help. He never lies to us. He never uses the fall-guy method of protecting himself. He takes the blame for our mistakes.

The Share Our Wealth Society numbers 326,000 in Louisiana. We have passed the 3,000,000 mark in America. We do not fear an attack. Those who attack us become our best friends when they discover their mistake. Our plan can be understood and described easily. Therefore, we do not depend on the press. We do not create a state of mind, we merely discover and recognize a state of mind that has been created by conditions. Millions of people have joined us just because of what has been passed to them by word of mouth.

Huey Long is the greatest headline writer I have ever seen. His circulars attract, bite, sting and convince. It is difficult to imagine what would happen in America if every human being were to read one Huey Long circular on the same day. As a mass-meeting speaker, his equal has never been known in America. His knowledge of national and international affairs, as well as local affairs, is uncanny. He seems to be equally at home with all subjects, such as shipping, railroads, banking, Biblical literature, psychology, merchandising, utilities, sports, Oriental affairs, international treaties, South American affairs, world history, the Constitution of the United States, the Napoleonic Code, construction, higher education, flood control, cotton, lumber, sugar, rice, alphabetical relief agencies. Besides this, I am convinced that he is the greatest political strategist alive. Huey Long is a superman. I actually believe that he can do as much in one day as any ten men I know. He abstains from alcohol, he uses no tobacco; he is strong, youthful and enthusiastic. Hostile communities and individuals move toward him like an avalanche once they see him and hear him speak. His greatest recommendation is that we who know him best, love him most.

GERALD L. K. SMITH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Oliver Twist Congressmen—Is Bacon Pork?—Labor vs. the Administration—Thank Father Coughlin and Mr. Hearst

THERE is vast discussion of other matters, but until this five-billion-dollar works-relief bill is out of the way, neither congressmen nor administration politicians outside of Congress are going to be vitally concerned about anything else. The practical political reason for this can be appreciated, I think, from the simple statement that while almost every phase of this bill has come in for criticism in Congress, there has not yet been so much as a suggestion from the Democratic side of reducing the appropriation. On the contrary, the very congressmen who most strongly object to some of the more sweeping powers conferred on the President by the measure are inclined to think he has not asked for enough money. This, in view of the stupendous and unprecedented sum included in the bill ($4,880,000,000) is almost incredible, but it is none the less true. Even the Republicans, who call this the Democratic 1936 campaign fund, are not suggesting cutting it down, but are making their whole fight in the Senate on the power provisions.

The reasons for this somewhat extraordinary situation are not difficult to grasp. They can be summed up in the single phrase "pressure from home." There is not a state or a congressional district in the country in which the unemployment and destitution problems are not acute. It is vital to the local units to obtain their full share of the forthcoming appropriation, not only in money to carry the unemployables now on the dole but in public projects. Every Governor, mayor, chamber of commerce and community is interested in obtaining full participation. So clearly and strongly is this manifested that, however hot the Senate debate over the details of the bill, no one has the least doubt now that it will go through in the end without the appropriation's being in any way diminished.

Almost anything else may be changed, but not the amount of the appropriation. That vast sum is the best insurance for the passage of the bill. This has been made apparent by the developments of the last few days. Already Senators and members of the House are being importuned by the interests back home to get this or that project through. They have been told that their states and districts depend on them to bring home the pork disguised as bacon. Under this bill, the only way that a Senator or Representative can meet these demands is by inducing the President to allocate the money or designate the public works desired. Realizing this, few members of Congress feel like handicapping themselves by opposing a bill that can be passed regardless of opposition. They still regard the President as human and believe he will feel more disposed to favor the ones who help him to get what he wants than those who prove recalcitrant and have to be rolled over. At any rate, they are sure that such will be the disposition of the ubiquitous Mr. Farley, who is certain to have a great deal to say about the personnel of the new machine, no matter how pure the purpose and no matter how non-partisan the surface set-up seems to be.

But to get away for a moment from this bill upon which, so long as it impends, hinges not only the whole 1935 New Deal program but the session of Congress, it is interesting, I think, and not unimportant that the resentment of organized labor leaders here in Washington toward the administration seems to be deepening on a number of grounds. One of these is the position taken by the White House in the automobile situation. These leaders charge that even during the investigation of working conditions by the National Industrial Recovery Board, the labor point of view was ignored and the labor representative on the board was not called into conference at the White House. The general feeling among labor leaders here is that the automobile manufacturers have been far more successful in impressing themselves upon Mr. Roosevelt than labor has been, and that they are likely to get nearly all they want in their code.

In the matter of the social-security program now before Congress, they claim that insufficient attention was given to the labor arguments and that the burden has not been fairly divided. William Green of the American Federation of Labor insists upon a five-percent payroll tax to carry the unemployment-insurance scheme. Labor generally is disposed to regard the pending plan as making the workingman carry too big a share. These views, they assert, were presented to the President's committee but were rejected by it, chiefly because of opposition by Miss Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

Still a third cause for friction between the administration and labor leaders lies in the presidential recommendation that the new public-works program should adopt a scale of wages larger than the dole but less than that prevailing in private industry. This is particularly offensive to organized labor because it makes it more difficult to maintain a decent scale in private industry. A fight to nullify the President's recommendation will be made in the Senate, but with doubtful chances of success. Mr. Roosevelt regards this matter of pay as the very essence of the new plan. He is persuaded that it is essential to recovery for the wages to be lower than those paid in industry. Otherwise, the government must compete with business and slow down the improvement upon which he counts. Hence, every ounce of White House weight will be used to frustrate labor's effort in this direction. If the President does so exert himself, he should have no difficulty in holding a majority to his will.

The defeat of the administration on the World Court proposal has somewhat encouraged the opposition, but I think this encouragement is not well founded. During this session no other issue is likely to arise that will call into action the combination of forces that blocked adherence. Also, on no other question except that of overriding a veto, will it be essential for anybody to obtain a two-thirds majority. It is true that immediately after the World Court vote there was a state resembling panic in the inner White House circle, where timidity is the chief quality of some of the more conspicuous members. They felt apprehensive about the entire administration program and communicated these apprehensions to congressional leaders. However, this state of mind did not last long. Before twenty-four hours had passed, various Senators who at the last minute had failed Mr. Roosevelt on the World Court

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

explained their position to the White House and received assurances that it was understood. As in previous instances of this sort—the overriding of the veto on the independent-offices bill last year, for example—as soon as the vote is over, administration Senators who desert the President are always anxious to convince him and, incidentally, their constituents, that while in this particular matter they were reluctantly compelled by their consciences to separate from him, at heart they are his loyal friends and supporters. Hence, the alarm of Roosevelt's strategists was without real cause and the balance of the program is in no real danger—at any rate not now.

Nevertheless, the defeat on the World Court issue was a surprise, whatever Senator Joe Robinson, the noble administration leader, may say. Anti-Court Senate leaders conceded ratification the day before the vote was taken, and so did the various pastors, comedians and others who spoke against it on the radio Sunday, January 27. Undoubtedly Father Coughlin's denunciation had considerable effect. Undoubtedly the bulk of the protesting telegrams that Monday and Tuesday poured in on Senators came from the emotional multitude that regularly listens to him. However, when the situation is analyzed, the defeat of the proposal this time is primarily due to the same man who has defeated it three times before; who, from the start, has been the brains and has supplied the management of the anti-Court fight. I mean, of course, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, who has furnished the anti-Court side with much more than mere journalistic support. Throughout this fight his representatives and agents were assembled in Washington in wartime strength. But for Mr. Hearst, we should have been in the Court twelve years ago.

Washington. T. R. B.

A Starry Evening

Calm is the season, cold and clear the air,
Sharp cold by which the draining blood is stung,
Heightened to clarity and made aware
Of the dark skeleton of trees and houses stripped of sun,
Grass chilled by snowcalm death, and gray dark
everywhere.

In other lands, in mirrors of this ice, I saw
The ancient winter of the soul and magnified,
Chilly, superb and glittering without flaw
That burning cold from which all warmth had died,
Stripped skeleton-sharp and linear-clean and white
Beneath an everlasting winter night
Shone every January leaf, each icy crystal thing
Calm, calm as on a starry evening.

O, whiteness, loved more than the sun's bright bronze,
Swan-feathered snow! chained landscape, frozen-dark,
No richness now, no passionate hemisphere
Rises before the aching thoughts depart.
But warning, premonition and restraint,
Acceptance, resignation and the fleet
Shadowy feet of joy that sings in flying
Till the dawn break and shadowy fears depart,
Endure the silences, O wintry heart.

MARYA ZATURENSKA.

Other People's Money

Who Was Talking Through Whose Hat?—
Cleaning the Wall Street Stables—
The Customer's Ash Can

FROM TIME to time it has been my privilege to be told by my old pal, the New York Stock Exchange, that I am talking through my hat. Many a poor soul has emerged from contact with that efficient cleaning establishment with nothing else to talk through. In my case, however, I have at intervals suggested points in which the Exchange was not quite perfect. And, of course, I have always been promptly informed that I was wrong.

On one occasion—in February of 1929—I ventured timidly to point out that stocks were already so high that a break sooner or later was inevitable and that when the break came, the machinery of the Exchange would prove inadequate to handle the liquidation, which would be at least 10,000,000 shares in a day, and that this would produce a panic. The article may be found in The Forum of that month. I have in my possession a letter from the Exchange indicating that these dire forebodings were coming, as usual, through my hat and that the idea of a 10,000,000-share day was too ridiculous to be thought of. Events answered that criticism in a year with a 16,000,000-share day, which is said to have been really 23,000,000 shares, and, as all the world knows, the breakdown of the machinery and a panic that holds an all-time record.

More recently I dared to enumerate some other flaws in what Mr. Whitney has called his "perfect institution." Here is a point that troubled my spirit. I find that people in the hinterland visualize the Exchange as, indeed, the Great Temple of the Money Changers. And they picture money changers as gentlemen of very large kidney; impressive-looking persons, with large paunches and high domes filled with tremendous, if dangerous, brains, money lords in appearance as well as in fact. The most disillusioning voyage I know of is a trip in the elevator of the Exchange. As brokers crowd in, the visitor is overwhelmed with amazement at the appearance of these giant Money Changers. They do not differ in appearance from a similar group of counter-jumpers or young police-court lawyers or even overgrown office boys. They are, I assure you, the sorriest-looking set of money lords you have ever rested your eyes upon. I have seen that magnificent person, Richard Whitney, the president of the Exchange, with the blue blood shining through every frozen pore, down in Washington in the midst of his brokers. It is an amazing spectacle.

Now all of these brokers are not commission brokers, representing the public. At least half of them are gamblers in their own right, chiselers or scalpers, specialists and such. In my confused way I have always believed that if the security markets of America were to be under the rule of the members of this Exchange, dominion should be in the hands of the bona-fide brokers, men who did a legitimate business as representatives of the public in the buying and selling of securities. I have felt that these scalpers, chiselers, floor traders, part-time specialists and whole-time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gamblers, even if permitted to be members of the Exchange (which is an indefensible notion) ought not to be permitted to have any part in its government. Instead they have for years exercised complete dominion over the Exchange. They have had an overwhelming majority on the board of governors. Under an electoral system they have been assured of permanence of that control. It is for this gang that the aristocratic Mr. Whitney speaks.

I have urged that the governors should at least be composed chiefly of commission brokers and that the system of electing only one-fourth of the directors every year should be abandoned. For a little arithmetic will reveal to you that it is necessary for members to stage three successive annual revolutions to dispossess the gambling gang from control. The outsider will see from this why the Exchange has so stoutly resisted all efforts from within and without to give it a cleaning. But now comes the Securities Exchange Commission and starts talking through its hat—declares all these things are true, that the brokers have only fourteen out of forty-two directors, while the floor traders, specialists and odd-lot traders have twenty-six; that the brokers should be given a majority and that a third instead of a fourth of the directors should be elected annually and by an open election, rather than one as well rigged as a Tammany primary. And not only does the S.E.C. talk through its hat, but now the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, comprising all the leading firms in Wall Street, passes a resolution through its advisory committee declaring that they approve these findings. And so, as it turns out, it was the Stock Exchange that was talking through its hat.

Furthermore, I have attempted on several occasions to picture that most amazing of spectacles—a Stock Exchange trial of a member on the complaint of a customer. There are two tribunals: the Business Conduct Committee and the Arbitration Committee. In the former, when an outraged customer complains that some broker has taken his shirt, he makes the accusation in writing. The broker is given the charge and files his reply in writing. The customer is not permitted to see the reply and the committee usually decides the case on the papers. The result is almost always the same. The customer is thrown out on his ear. He must then submit to the Arbitration Committee. He cannot have counsel and the arbitrators are the fellow brokers of the accused. The customer must pay the costs if he loses. And he almost always loses. He is tossed into the ash can outside the Exchange and handed a bill for six or seven hundred dollars or a thousand for "expenses."

Timidly, and through my hat, I have ventured to suggest that this comic judiciary really belonged in burlesque. But now the S.E.C. yells out through its hat that the system is bad and the association of brokers mutters through its hat that the S.E.C. is right.

Little by little the whiskers will be removed from the features of this expensive big masquerader. The S.E.C. has suggested that the Exchange do a little shaving itself. But the Commission must not overlook the fact that Congress has put into its hands an effective pair of shears and a formidable razor. And if the Stock Exchange doesn't remove the whiskers promptly, it should be thrown in the chair and forcibly barbered. JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

The Automobile Code—Getting Rid of a Pretense—Unorganized Workers—Reducing the Sharecroppers—Ward Rodgers

THIS WEEK the most important labor news comes not from the picket line, as one might expect, but from the White House, where President Roosevelt has just given the Automobile Code—and the Automobile Labor Board—a lease on life for another four months. For in renewing this Code, despite the bitter protests of the A.F. of L., it appears that the President has definitely decided to take on the duties of supreme arbiter in labor matters. His action on the Automobile Code—like that of a week earlier on the Newspaper Code—quite plainly represented his own decision and not that of his advisers. The National Industrial Recovery Board had voted 3 to 2 against the Code's extension. It is also noteworthy that the representatives of the automobile workers, like those of the newspaper workers, were left out in the cold while the President conferred with the representatives of the industry—Mr. Walter P. Chrysler and Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr. The pretense that labor has a voice—or even a right to be heard—has apparently been discarded. At least no attempt is being made to keep it up.

What is particularly disturbing, is that the President, in extending the term of the Automobile Labor Board, has given it an official status that it did not previously possess. During the past year this Board has been part of an agreement between the employers and employees. It was established as part of the President's settlement of the threatened automobile strike last March. Today, however, this settlement exists only on paper so far as the A.F. of L. and other independent unions among the auto workers are concerned. The A.F. of L. has, in fact, already publicly announced its withdrawal from the agreement and its decision to boycott the Board. The reasons for this are well known: The Board has served chiefly to strengthen the company unions and has failed to satisfy the auto workers in its adjudication of complaints. However, there is now the definite hint from the President that the auto workers must deal with the Board whether they want to or not.

Doubtless, this news will contribute its share to the growing dissatisfaction in the auto plants. But that it will precipitate the much talked of general strike seems unlikely. The auto workers are neither organized nor prepared for such a fight. The best proof of this is provided by the recent elections conducted by the Automobile Labor Board. Among some 50,000 auto workers, approximately 90 percent declared they were unaffiliated and only about 5 percent voted for the A.F. of L. Of course the A.F. of L. is stronger than these results suggest. One must remember that the voting took place in the auto plants, that the ballots required the workers to write in everything—both the names and the affiliations of the representatives they wanted, and that the A.F. of L. advised its own members not to vote. Even with these qualifications, however, the elections can hardly be interpreted as revealing any formidable union strength. If a strike comes, it is highly likely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be a sporadic affair without any vigorous leadership.

Meanwhile, the parallel treatment given the automobile and newspaper workers by the President—his indifference to the grievances of both—is disturbing. It lends no assurance whatever to the hopes of labor that Mr. Roosevelt intends to make Section 7a meaningful. Labor leaders have been trusting that the present weaknesses and inconsistencies in Roosevelt's labor policy would be ironed out by Senator Wagner's proposed labor-disputes bill. But if the President yields to the demands of industry now, there is no reason for believing that he will not also yield on the same vital points when the Wagner bill comes up for action. His renewal of the Automobile Code brought what looks to be a definite break between the administration and the A.F. of L. It is not impossible that this may produce such protest from workers throughout the country that Mr. Roosevelt will feel he cannot safely ignore it.

Under the crop-reduction program sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, tenant farmers and sharecroppers are not supposed to be deprived of their livelihood. In fact it is specifically provided in the acreage-reduction contracts signed between the government and the landowners that the latter should continue to employ a "normal number of tenants and other employees." But despite this provision, Southern landlords have proceeded to evict and dispossess thousands of families among the million and half tenant farmers and sharecroppers. Obviously, if they can get away with this practice, their profits from the government's benefit payments are increased, while the unemployed agricultural help is placed on relief.

Recently, however, such violations have met with increased resistance from the agricultural workers. In Arkansas, they have organized the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union and, with the support of the American Civil Liberties Union and sympathetic groups of educators and clergymen in the South, they have brought an injunction suit against an Arkansas planter to restrain him from evicting twenty-five families. The Department of Agriculture has also intervened in the suit and notified the defendant that it would withhold further payments on his crop-reduction contract until the charges filed against him in court were investigated. The case is now being appealed to the Arkansas Supreme Court. If it is won, it may provide an effective weapon to prevent wholesale evictions by the planters.

But meanwhile, the Southern landowners are waging a bitter campaign to break up the union and organization of the sharecroppers. Many families are being threatened with eviction merely for belonging to the union, while the union leaders are being threatened with lynching. As part of the intimidation technique, Ward H. Rodgers, a young graduate of the Boston University Divinity School and an organizer of the farmers' union, was recently convicted of criminal anarchy. Mr. Rodgers had done nothing more violent than address an open meeting, but the fact that he had been counseling the sharecroppers to protect their rights was enough to mark him as an enemy of the South's feudal system. It seems clear that organization promises the sharecroppers their most effective protection against the injustices produced by the government's agricultural program. But this hardly absolves the government of its responsibility in the matter.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Parochialism in Music

SIR: In your issue of January 16 Irving Kolodin advances several curious arguments. He states, in effect, that composers whom he believes to be "preëminent" (principally Copland, Harris, Piston and Sessions) should not be played because they are not indigenous or, rather, because they are indigenous for the wrong reasons. And that composers whose music he feels to be "rosewater" and in which he finds "little to admire" (MacDowell, Chadwick, Hanson and Sowerby) should be played more often and should plot the course for American composers to follow.

He describes, but does not define, what Americanism in music means to him. It consists, apparently, of "promise of a native speech" and music in which is "manifested some extraordinary flow of one's people and some large element of nationality." These qualities, he indicates, spring from the "essential being" and from that "sheer human stuff" called character. From the qualities that he demands in American music it would seem that Mr. Kolodin is advocating that all composers be confined to the folk themes of their respective countries so that their music will be adequately national—a form for fascism in music.

But this cannot be his point, since he does show signs of recognizing the fact that music—as well as nationality—has its source in the "essential being," in character: that it was the Teutonism of the mind, character and sensibility of Beethoven and Bach that assigns their music to Germany, just as it was the Frenchness of Debussy (and not at any time the use of native themes) that credits his music to France—if one has the type of mind that must pigeonhole music in that fashion. So it is the Americanism of Copland, Harris, Piston and Sessions that has, does and will stamp their music as American—just as they, in a crowd, are inescapably American because of their manner of gesturing, talking and laughing as well as by the way they think and feel. And so it was with Charles Ives (whom Mr. Kolodin curiously did not even mention) and to whom belated homage has been done in his own country only by the particular group of composers who, Mr. Kolodin states, "have consciously rejected the dull virtues of their own soil."

The fact that the Americanism of the music of the composers whom Mr. Kolodin is attacking is not perceptible to him may have something to do with the fact that their music also has no power to communicate to him. There is the possibility that the fault may not be entirely, as he suggests, with the composers.

Mr. Kolodin's article does not puzzle me—it is the opinion of one individual with whom I am in disagreement. But the printing of it by The New Republic does baffle me. I fully realize that printing it does not mean that the editors are in agreement with the opinions expressed. But the magazine has a policy—and with that policy Mr. Kolodin's article is in fundamental disagreement—unless I am greatly mistaken. The New Republic would not give two and a quarter pages to a plea for nationalism and insularity in politics or in economics—why did it do so in music?

New York City. MARY LESCAZE.

[Nationalism in politics is something quite different from national expression in art, the latter being a subject for debate with a good deal to be said on both sides—THE EDITORS.]

SIR: It was with much interest that I read Mr. Irving Kolodin's penetrating article, "Wanted—An American Composer," in The New Republic of January 16. The complaint of this writer with respect to the lack of worthwhile American talent strikes me as being unjustifiable. Mr. Kolodin has the unhappy gift of dismissing important composers with too much facility. The relegation of Roy Harris, in particular, to a minor position with the implication that he is overrated and that he possesses "a musical mentality with but slight capacity for extended thinking," is a conclusion that involves the critic as much as it does the composer. Despite Mr. Kolodin's lugubrious want-ad, Roy Harris is, of all the men writing music in America at this time, one of the most important. This is said with all due respect to the valuable contributions by Copland, Sessions, Piston and many others. I feel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it is not enough to select but one work of a composer, as Mr. Kolodin has done with Harris' "Second Symphony," and from this specific composition decry the composer's ability, and, in effect, all his works. . . .

I take issue with another of Mr. Kolodin's assertions, namely, that discipline can be achieved by experience. (The exact quotation is that "its [Harris' "Second Symphony"] occasional outbursts of vigor are mitigated by a lack of the discipline that experience should have given him." By experience Mr. Kolodin, I presume, means years of waiting and practice.) That is not particularly true, for a sense of discipline is born at the very outset in the composer. Beethoven had as much discipline when he composed his Opus 1 as he had when he completed his masterly Opus 135. And Rossini, during a long life devoted to composition, never acquired an iota of discipline. So "experience" was unnecessary to Beethoven, and it was useless to Rossini. Harris possesses the discipline of an artist who, even before the composition is set down on paper, has already clarified and selected in his mind the ideas pertaining to form, thematic details and other important matters. . . .

I am inclined to think, though I stand for correction, that Mr. Kolodin has come to his present conclusion of dismissing the values of Harris' music purely on the ground of his antipathy towards the composer's "Second Symphony." I am sure that he would hesitate to say the same things about, or impute the same faults to, Harris' Concerto, the Piano Sonata, the Trio and the String Quartet. These works stand on the merits of definite musical values, and the totality of values is such that it supersedes the criticism of those who find little intrinsic worth in his music.

New York City. WILLIAM KOZLENKO.

Three-Percent Security

SIR: I think your readers will be interested in seeing a resolution recently adopted by the Board of Directors of the National Federation of Settlements, in regard to the administration's present program for social security.

HELEN HALL,
President, the National Federation of Settlements.

[ENCLOSURE]

BE IT RESOLVED that we endorse the security program of the Roosevelt administration, embodied in the new Wagner-Lewis Bill, as a welcome forward move except with respect to unemployment insurance. The first Wagner-Lewis Bill for unemployment insurance, introduced last year with the backing of the administration, provided for a five-percent payroll tax and for national standards below which the states should not fall. The present bill is a step backward at both points. It provides for a three-percent tax, and carries no standards whatever as to amount or length of benefits or as to other factors which must be laid down if the workers of the nation as a whole are to get protection through unemployment compensation.

The report of the President's Committee on Economic Security recommended "a coöperative federal-state system, which permits variations in state laws but ensures uniformity in respects in which uniformity is absolutely essential." But what are the absolute essentials set in the new Wagner-Lewis Bill? The bill calls for a uniform payroll tax on all the employers of America, so that the employers of any one state may be protected against unfair competition from the employers in other states should they set a lower tax or none at all. The bill calls for protecting the funds raised by placing them in a trust fund in the hands of the federal Treasury. But this is where national uniformity stops. So far as the protection of the unemployed themselves is concerned, the states are left free to experiment.

The actuarial tables put before the states as a basis for their experimentation indicate that the three-percent payroll tax proposed will afford only fifteen weeks' coverage at half wages provided that first the unemployed worker must go through a waiting period of four weeks without benefit. These actuarial tables show that on a five-percent tax base, the waiting period can be cut down to two weeks and the benefit period raised to thirty.

We believe that nothing less than that coverage will make unemployment compensation practical as a first line of defense for American workers. Without such standards, we shall be forced to combine relief with unemployment insurance in order to meet family need in many cases. . . .

We believe that national minimum standards of protection, below which no state can go, are the crux of federal legislation in this field. We believe that the federal payroll tax of three percent on the employers of each state should be matched by a contribution of at least two percent from the federal Treasury itself, so that through the income tax all of us will share in meeting the cost of that security and stability in our economic life on which all of us depend.

The Kernel of Liberalism

SIR: I find your leader ["Liberalism Twenty Years After," The New Republic, January 23] extremely interesting and for the most part I go along with you. My differences with you are mainly in point of definitions. For my part I do not see why we who were once called liberals and still adhere to the essentials of our liberal faith should follow journalistic usage in identifying liberalism with any particular attitude toward specific practical and transitory issues. As I have always conceived it, the kernel of liberalism is the assertion of the inherent worth of the human individual; his right to the maximum practicable share in the control of his own destiny; the collective duty to protect the individual in this right, by whatever methods and devices the times may require.

Liberalism in this sense does not conceive that defense of the rights of the individual is merely a governmental function, but a social function as well. Indeed, at specific times the principal function of liberalism may be to protect the individual against the government. At other times it may be that the chief function of liberalism is, with the aid of government, to protect the individual against predatory and oppressive private interests. But liberalism is also bound to protect the individual against other forces that may cripple his development, such as disease or ignorance.

That the individual may control his own destiny he must enjoy the right of association in defense of his interests. He must enjoy freedom of speech, freedom to investigate and publish, for without these liberties neither can the individual live a full life nor can the collectivity be awakened to an enlightened appreciation of individual rights or needs.

I do not accept the view that men are so generally dominated by individual and class interests that progress can be made only by the clash of forces, ultimately by revolution. I do not deny that there are conditions in which the opposing interests are so brutally rigid that no solution is possible except by force. In the circumstances it is seldom that a really satisfactory solution can be attained at all, until the results established by force have been modified and moralized by the development of liberalism, under whatever name.

ALVIN JOHNSON, Director.
The New School for Social Research.

New York City.

Extracts from Letters

THE American People's Schools send the following from their New York office: "Some of your readers may be interested to know of the opening of the first unit of the American People's Schools near Van Cortlandt park. There is a lecture discussion hour each evening (except Wednesday) . . . followed by a period of activity in dramatics, pottery, sketching, creative, social or folk dancing. The instruction is non-academic and informal, especially adapted to the needs and interests of young adults. There are no textbooks, examinations or grades, and no scholastic entrance requirements. . . . Costs are extremely moderate. Further information may be obtained from the American People's Schools, 67 Stevenson Place or 545 Fifth Avenue."

Philip E. Keller of the Department of Economics, Stanford University, California, is making a study of the life and sociological ideas of the late Simon Nelson Patten. He would appreciate hearing from persons having any biographical information or Patten letters.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Particular and General

Escape Me Never, by Margaret Kennedy. Schubert Theatre, January 21, 1935.

The Petrified Forest, by Robert Sherwood. Broadhurst Theatre, January 7, 1935.

MISS Bergner's performance in "Escape Me Never" brings up the eternal question of how much an actor should put meanings and implications and moving force into drama that is shallow. On the whole, since the play is worth so little in such cases, it would seem best—certainly what an artist would require—to give us some good acting at least. This is what Duse thought when she blew the top off one piece of theatre rubbish after another. This is what Miss Elisabeth Bergner does in her current performance of "Escape Me Never."

The story of this play is a continuation of Miss Kennedy's Sanger family flavor in "The Constant Nymph." A stray young girl; musicians of the master's begetting, one of them gifted and loose, the other steady, untalented and admirable, good for husbandries; a rich girl. In the end the two scatterers, vague verities in their kind, cling to each other; the solider couple go away somewhat wiser for the others' sins and mishaps. The theme itself is not bad. The play, however, is a thin dish, half a bad novel; you resent bothering about such fiddle-faddle, or rather being made to bother about it by the acting of Miss Bergner and Mr. Sinclair. Mr. Hugh Sinclair plays on a level above anything I have hitherto seen him do; the whole performance that he gives is convincing and not without pathos. It is all so open and fluent that the question arises as to how much a performance is affected by the player opposite; how much, in sum, Miss Bergner's gift of reality has released Mr. Sinclair's own powers. Whatever we may decide about that, he gives an excellent performance.

Speaking of Duse, this is as good a time as any to demonstrate with the critical tendency to use that great artist as a sort of National Puretest Standard, Grade A, et cetera. Duse does not stand for a certain grade in acting, the top, the best, and so on. She stands more or less for a certain method, and she stands for quality. One of the many tragedies of a woman who seemed to be pursued by and to invite tragedy, is this nonsensical use of her name. It seems that Miss Bergner has been not seldom compared to Duse. I have not seen Miss Bergner in any other version of her acting, and must, therefore, speak only of her performance in "Escape Me Never." In this case to compare her to Duse is worse than silly. In a certain actuality, or partial realism, there is a mild relationship in name. In every other way there is nothing at all.

For such people as are not interested in talking nonsense, it is worth noting, perhaps, that compared to Duse's whole quality and method, Miss Bergner differs, first of all, in distinction. Miss Bergner's wraith young woman, full of Kiki-isms and fidgeting, scratching herself, shy-pathetic winnings, numberless wigglings and small businesses, is the very opposite of Duse's process, which was to eliminate the major part of what is incidental, to choose what is characteristic and do it so securely and subtly that it enters to the total essential design, then to organize the whole to a kind of essential realism, not incidental, cluttered or trivial. In Miss Bergner's performance there was too much done about too little; at times it lacked taste.

The fact remains, nevertheless, that Miss Bergner in "Escape Me Never" is a moving and admirable actress. In the scene where, with her back to the audience, she makes us for the first time feel sure that the girl loves this man she is living with, she is extraordinary; and in diverse other scenes as well. In scenes like that at the lunch stall, after the death of her baby, the banality of conception behind the scene is too much for her.

On this score of too much repetition and scratching, Mr. Leslie Howard in "The Petrified Forest" could, for all Miss Bergner's many roles—some of them, the report is, very fine—teach her a great deal. Through his performance of this lost spirit, this waster, this poet and pure, long searcher for what, who knows? he moves without exaggeration, without repetition—his head, for example, after he has tramped in and taken off his hat, does not go on itching every time a phrase needs to be placed or picked up; he comforts his brow with one touch and then presently a slighter one. Mr. Howard is one of the few actors we have who can make good taste dramatic in itself, which is to say a part of the character seen as acting on the event. The implications of his latest performance are lyric and reflective; he creates a genuine poetry of faith and passion in the midst of an habitual disillusion of mind.

Mr. Sherwood's play deserves, in the midst of this season, all the success it has had. The formula of its comic portions is Shavian; in fact one may be astonished at the vitality still in Mr. Shaw's characteristic inversions. We have here the story of a gasoline station in the desert, a young girl whose French war-mother has not been able to stick it and has gone back to Bourges, divorced her American Legion mate and married again. France seems to the young girl all that is beautiful, dancing in the streets, wise, and loving love. The killer comes, with his bodyguards. In the end the wanderer makes his insurance policy out to the girl and gets the killer to shoot him. The killer escapes, and the play ends telephoning the sheriff how to catch him. This is a ridiculous account of a story that is inventive and caustic and chiefly delightful. "The Petrified Forest" is a rest from the bourgeois seriousness that many of our plays exhibit, a solemn exhibition of very little, and from the exhibitionisms and chips-on-the-shoulder of many of our fairly expert Times Square pieces. We can thank Mr. Sherwood for remembering the lesson of certain excellent dramatists—for example, Benavente, Shaw and Molière—that vibration is necessary. Good, lively sensibility tells him that the mind also may disport itself in the midst of this desert, gasoline-station, killer, melodramatic, dreaming situation. After all there are many people present in the theatre who are not learning culture in the butler's pantry.

The end of "The Petrified Forest" wobbles a bit, for the last two minutes, as if seeking a way to bring the curtain down. But in the main the play is engaging, vibrant, slightly fantastic and atmospherically and humanly poetic. It has many full, revealing speeches. One of these comes where the hero, after the killer has kept his promise and shot him, says to the girl that it does not hurt, at least it does not seem to. Granted the dramatic moment, almost the whole character is in that speech. It would make a fine curtain.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Letter to England

I SAID that most of the stories and poems and knowing epigrams reprinted in "The Smart Set Anthology" are beginning to smell of mold and lavender. I said that reading them today is like pawing through a trunk in the lumber-room of a rented house and wondering who could have been thrilled by these preposterous gowns and artificial flowers—and who in the world ever thought that these white nainsook drawers with imitation-lace frills at the bottom were unmentionable! But The Smart Set, I said, made a great noise in its time and did a lot of good along with incalculable damage. . . .

I was writing an article on contemporary American literature for one of the London weeklies. Quite naturally, in addressing readers on the other side of the Atlantic, one adopts a different point of view. The writer takes three steps backwards in order to gain a longer perspective; he tries to emphasize the outlines of the picture at the expense of the details; he generalizes and pontificates. Sometimes the simple and definite pattern that results is of interest to readers in his own country. I hope it is, at any rate, for I intend without more apologies to copy most of the American letter that I wrote for a recent issue of Time and Tide.

Better than any other magazine [I said], better than any book whatever, The Smart Set typifies the second of three distinct stages through which American literature has passed since 1900.

During the first of these stages, which lasted till 1918 or thereabouts, the atmosphere was predominantly British and provincial. New York and Boston were like Liverpool and Edinburgh. Writers here chose British models to imitate, mostly those of the Victorian era. But because there are some types of cultural influence that grow stronger as they travel outward from the center—and also because disciples are more dogmatic than their masters—the reign of belated Victorianism in New York was even stiffer and stuffier than Victoria's English reign. In Burton Rascoe's introduction to "The Smart Set Anthology" there is a story that symbolizes the whole period. It seems that Robert Louis Stevenson, passing through New York, paid a visit to The Century Magazine. The editor would not admit Mr. Stevenson to his office on the ground that Mr. Stevenson was not respectable. Everyday life in general—anything that felt or smelled or tasted of reality—was barred out of American magazine offices on the same principle.

The book publishers, then as now, could afford to be more lenient. A few good novels and scores of promising novels were printed in the years before the War. But there was one generality that applied to most of the talented writers as well as to the bad ones, namely, that they expressed and represented only one stratum of American society. Their morals and manners, their virtues and limitations, were those of prosperous people living near the Atlantic seaboard. Literature was regarded as an effeminate upper-class affair open chiefly to men with a Harvard education. There were a few mavericks like Dreiser and Jack London, there was a vast literary underworld of poor devils freezing in garrets, but most of the successful and widely copied writers were well-to-do men used to sitting at the tables of millionaires. They imposed a general level of respectable dullness.

The Smart Set helped to introduce a second stage in American literary taste. It aimed to be a little disreputable (*though without ever going far enough to run the risk of* suppression by the incredibly strict post-office censorship). It was "A Magazine of Cleverness," whose prime purpose was "To Provide Lively Entertainment for Minds That Are Not Primitive." And its editorial policy was un-British, even anti-British. Especially after 1912, the stories it imported and the great models it held up for imitation were likely to be German, Austrian or French. The Smart Set began to have a vast prestige among the younger writers; it set them to making 2.75-percent Nietzschean epigrams and to dreaming of beery-romantic picnics in the Vienna woods.

But it also had a social side and one that presented a rather significant paradox. Originally it was intended as an upper-class literary magazine. Its founder was an—except to his victims—entertaining rogue who got most of his income from a society blackmailing sheet. Long after The Smart Set had passed into other hands, it continued to talk a great deal about aristocracy and to ridicule the respectable middle classes. The paradox lay in the fact that, after 1914, its editors, its contributors in great majority and at least nine-tenths of its readers were obviously and unalterably middle-class. They were young for the most part, the sons and daughters of small lawyers, ministers, physicians or business men. They wanted to escape from their class limitations, they wanted to be cosmopolitan and sophisticated, but they didn't quite know how to go about it. For this reason the stories they read and wrote and edited had a quality of strain and falseness sometimes rising to high burlesque. Of a typical Smart Set heroine it would be said that "None of her attributes could be designated the Menteith's most living charm, neither the timbre of her caroling laugh, the poise of her carriage, nor her green eyes' *chatoyant* allure." The heroes for their part would be "long, lean men, decadent aristocrats, high-bred indolents, subtle, bored, indifferent, dispassionate souls." They were all ghosts dressed in clothes from Bond Street or the Rue de la Paix. But I am rather tempted to believe it was the clothes that were insubstantial and ghostly; inside them could be recognized the bodies of nice corn-fed boys and girls from Ohio or Alabama, strutting the boulevards, bursting with eagerness to prove that they were subtle, bored and indifferent.

All this happened toward the beginning of the second literary period. Before the end of it—that is, by 1929—The Smart Set had disappeared along with most of the affectations it helped to inspire. The corn-fed boys and girls had either grown into their imported clothes or else had learned the wisdom of dressing to resemble themselves. Aristocracy wasn't so much talked about. It was evident that American literature had become chiefly a middle-class product, without the manners, the reticences, the it-can't-be-saids that ruling classes generally cultivate.

Then, beginning in 1930, there was another swift and striking change. It was as if literary values had been listed on the stock exchange, as if they had been offered and bid for like shares in the automotive industries or in public utilities, and as if, on Black Thursday, they had all come tumbling down. Several of the writers who had distinguished themselves during the preceding decade suddenly fell silent; they had the air of being dazed. All the ideal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they had fought for were being called into question: nobody any longer showed an interest in cosmopolitan sophistication or significant form or probing the unconscious or building a castle of beauty remote from the world. New issues were being argued—more bitterly than the old ones, since the quarrels rising ordinarily from vanity and temperament were now mingled with class hatreds. At the same time, a whole new generation of novelists was appearing.

Many of these were distinguished in point of social origin from the writers who preceded them. During the prosperous years there had been a wider diffusion of education: not only small business men but also farmers, railway workers and skilled mechanics had been sending their sons and daughters to the state universities. Some of these students from poorer families had literary talent and new things to write about. At other times they might have been absorbed into the great middle classes, but after the depression there seemed to be no more chance for rising in the world, and accordingly they retained their working-class loyalties. . . . This may or may not be a sufficient explanation for what has been happening in the literary world. There is the fact, in any case, that many of the talented writers who have appeared since 1930—Erskine Caldwell, Jack Conroy, Robert Cantwell, William Saroyan, James Farrell, Grace Lumpkin, Albert Halper and others—either come from what we have learned to call the proletariat or else have allied themselves with it by writing about strikes from the standpoint of the strikers.

And so the last thirty years of American literature make such a neat pattern that I hesitate to define it, out of an habitual distrust for neat patterns and a consciousness of the thousand and one exceptions that distort them. First there were the upper-class writers, then the middle-class writers, and now, since the depression, there are the proletarian writers, though they cannot claim to dominate even the field of fiction, let alone those of poetry and criticism. First there was the English influence, then the Continental influence, mostly French, with a touch of German through The Smart Set, and now. . . . It can scarcely be said that the new foreign influence is Russian so far as technique is concerned. There is no doubt, however, that many of the younger novelists and poets are being inspired by the world revolutionary movement, that political ideas play a large part in their writing, and that their politics are those of Lenin rather than T. S. Eliot, let us say, or Ramsay MacDonald.

MALCOLM COWLEY.

Poor Man's Burden

Human Exploitation, by Norman Thomas. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 422 pages. $2.75.

NORMAN THOMAS has here retold, with some old facts and many new ones, the story of human exploitation and human waste under capitalism in America. The same story has been told in recent years by scores of other investigators and writers. Indeed, Mr. Thomas himself draws quite freely upon the works of these other students to supplement or substantiate some of his own observations. Yet, despite its familiar aspects, I find this story of seemingly endless mass misery ever fresh and ever startling. The extent and depth of this human exploitation would appear almost incredible were it not for the documentary proof that students such as Norman Thomas give us. But even more startling is the apparently slim prospect of getting anything of enduring consequence done toward putting an end to these conditions.

In this work Mr. Thomas has not been content to sketch only the usual picture of labor exploitation, but has also gone down to the lower depths to learn how those who stand at the very bottom may be living. In dealing with the farmers he emphasizes the economic and social problems of the renters and share-croppers: their inadequate housing, which puts the average city slum to blush; their diet, upon which only pellagra can thrive; their economic dependence upon landlords, which is really a form of peonage or serfdom. In discussing the lumber industry he begins with an account of the land-grabbing of the last century and the ruthless exploitation of the country's virgin timber, and ends with a discussion of living conditions among the timber workers and of other consequences of the waste of our forests.

Coal miners, automobile workers, textile-mill hands, women and children in industry, the Negro, are similarly dealt with. The problem of unemployment receives a special chapter, as does also the struggle of labor to get itself organized. Throughout the book there runs a thread of criticism of the New Deal, which is particularly pertinent in view of the Roosevelt administration's failure, in spite of its lofty sentiments and widely advertised humanitarianism, to redeem its promises to the submerged classes. For some reason or other, unhappily, Mr. Thomas did not see fit to comment at any length upon the manner in which the Roosevelt administration has sabotaged Section 7a of the Recovery Act, though in the opinion of many students nothing else has so plainly revealed the true nature of the New Deal.

Mr. Thomas attempts also to identify the interests of the lower middle class with those of the working class. In one chapter he seeks to show that exploitation under capitalism hurts not only the factory worker and share-cropper, but also the consumer. The man who must buy the things he needs out of wages or salary or out of the earnings of some small business—whether he is a worker or a farmer or a tradesman—is the man who pays for the titanic waste and extortion of monopoly and finance capitalism. In another chapter the author points out that the "little owner," who is usually a devoted adherent of capitalism because he happens to own a little property, is as much a victim of capitalist exploitation as the factory mechanic or Negro share-cropper.

The facts Mr. Thomas has to present are tangible and irrefutable. We cannot have too much of this sort of information if we hope to make any progress toward relieving or abolishing these conditions. Yet the book has a grievous defect. Mr. Thomas, after all, is not merely a radical journalist, not merely a student of sociology. He is the acknowledged leader of the Socialist movement in the United States. Because of this, one is entitled to look to him for something more than a recital of facts, however important or invaluable his facts may be. The worker who needs to be helped is justified in asking him not only what is wrong, but why it is wrong and what can be done to correct that wrong. It is not enough to say simply that socialism will set things right. It must be established first that these things cannot be set right under capitalism, and this cannot be done through simple exposition, but only by thorough and sound analysis. But neither in this work nor in any of his other recent writings has Mr. Thomas attempted a fundamental analysis of the economic forces at work in modern society. He knows what is wrong, but he has yet to explain logically and convincingly why it is wrong. Until he can do so the soundness of his own solution must remain open to serious question.

MAURITZ A. HALLGREN.

20769

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Gets the Aces?

The Economic Consequences of the New Deal, by Benjamin Stolberg and Warren Jay Vinton. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 85 pages. $1.

ELIPHAZ, Bildad and Zophar thought upon the words of Job. Then spoke Zophar and said: "Should not the multitude of words be answered? And should a man full of talk be justified? For thou hast said thy doctrine is pure." And so the New Deal, with its priests and prophets, has also, like Job, its comforters.

If simple language and clear thinking can carry conviction, it must be granted Messrs. Stolberg and Vinton that they have called the New Deal by its true name. While many others have been applying to it such loose labels as "socialism," "fascism" and "state capitalism," these critics of the current program use eighty-five small pages of vigorous language in saying what it is. Their method of explaining a thing by telling how it works is consistent with the best expository practice. The gist of it—although this gist is given elaborate meaning in the authors' detailed analysis and argument—is that the New Deal is the same old set of forces and values, affirmed by the federal government and proclaimed with new and resounding ballyhoo. The result, say these authors, is that "the aces dealt by the New Deal have somehow fallen right where they were before."

The way the deal, old and new, falls out is that a small number of people own a large part of the national wealth and receive a large part of the national income, while the remaining very large number of people can claim only a very small part of the national wealth and income. The control over production exercised by the large-ownership few runs in terms of restriction and withholding of production. Conscious creation of scarcity is the accredited means of achieving the ends sought by the powerful controlling group. The New Deal simply puts the authority of the government behind this restrictive principle. Its methods of "generating recovery"—stopping liquidation and "priming the pump"—have therefore resulted in stalemate.

Messrs. Stolberg and Vinton have not, in this little book, gone beyond the negatively critical level of analysis. Neither in matters of detail, nor in the larger area of comprehensive programs for economic reform, do they make any positive recommendations. They point out that in the crucial days of March, 1933, "the New Deal could have nationalized our banking system." There is much that might be said as to what the New Deal could have done with the banking system if it had been nationalized. But the authors do not say it. As regards an organizing idea for an economic system, while none is stated explicitly by the authors, they offer a clear basis for positive thinking and selection by the reader. The basis is their demonstration that any kind of system that has consistency among its parts will work better in its own terms than a system without such consistency.

This book should find congenial readers among the great host of "practical" people who "learn from experience." Such readers should readily agree that our experience in the New Era of Mr. Coolidge ought to have taught us that business men and others simply will not carry out agreements made jointly if and when it will pay them better, individually, not to carry them out. The book is recommended also to those people who believe that there is some kind of "radicalism" in the New Deal. Radicalism? Well, using a pulmotor is a radical way of getting a person to breathe; but its use rests on a quite conservative theory of respiration.

HORACE TAYLOR.

The Nature of Armies

The Ghost of Napoleon, by Liddell Hart. New Haven: Yale University Press. 199 pages. $2.50.

THE PRINCIPAL thesis of Captain Hart's book runs as follows: The eighteenth century produced several great analysts and reformers of the art of war, notably Marshal Saxe, Bourcet and Guibert. These prepared the way for Napoleon, who in his very first campaign proved himself a master of "organized dispersion," mobility and surprise. His strategy and tactics were dominated by their conceptions until Austerlitz and Jena. Then a change came over his method; unlimited mass force displaced fine coördination. The results were shown in the battles of Eylau and Aspern, in the Spanish and Russian campaigns. Then came Clausewitz, "the Mahdi of mass," who became the military teacher of all Europe. Result: the stalemate of the last War.

One may admire Captain Hart's exposition of the various military theories, as well as his extensive and profound knowledge of military history, without accepting the thesis that the later Napoleon and Clausewitz were responsible for the recent stupid mass slaughter. Was it faulty military theory that brought on the stalemate, or was it the economic and political condition of Europe? The question is of more than theoretical interest. If the former, then we need only adopt a new theory in order to make of the next war a work of art; but if the latter, then the next war will be more ruinous than the last. To Captain Hart's theory of the omnipotence of a faulty theory, we oppose the following sentence on page 16 of this book (a sentence that seems to have been completely forgotten by its author): "The nature of armies is determined by the nature of the civilization in which they exist." Given the immense development of industry, transportation and communications, given also the existence of great states engaged in deadly imperialist rivalry, the size of all armies was bound to be vastly increased. When the War came and a flood of Germans poured over France, the French were bound to oppose them with a dyke of Frenchmen, irrespective of all military theories. There was Napoleon, but there aren't any ghosts.

HERMAN SIMPSON.

The Scarecrow Exhumed

Autopsy of the Monroe Doctrine, by Gaston Nerval. New York: The Macmillan Company. 368 pages. $3.50.

DESPITE its defects, this volume constitutes the best criticism of the Monroe Doctrine in English. After successfully challenging the traditional view that the "original" Monroe Doctrine was disinterested and humanitarian, the author indicts it on ten counts, the most important of which are: it is worn out and useless; it did not create Pan-Americanism, but, on the contrary, arrested the Bolivarian Pan-Americanism of equal rights and mutual obligations; it has been violated and disregarded by the European powers against which it has been directed with the knowledge and, at times, the connivance of the United States; it has been distorted to serve as an instrument of the hegemony of the United States in the Western Hemisphere; it is in conflict with all the modern peace machinery of the world and the present trends of international relations.

The author believes that the Montevideo Conference,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while a diplomatic success for Secretary Hull, did not differ substantially from previous Pan-American gatherings. The task still remains of laying down new principles of inter-American conduct. Thus, Mr. Nerval urges the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine; the substitution of a Pan-American doctrine of joint responsibility; and the organization of American peace, including the establishment of a Pan-American court of justice.

Unfortunately Mr. Nerval has not attempted to give us an objective treatise on the Monroe Doctrine. His book is written in the manner of a prosecuting attorney rather than that of a judge. It treats complicated issues with an extremely broad brush and blames the Monroe Doctrine for many sins of American foreign policy only remotely connected with it. What has been at fault in the past has been the desire of the United States for irresponsible power in the Western Hemisphere, limited only by a conception of its interests. The Monroe Doctrine has not been the cause of a desire that has been common to all Great Powers in the modern world, but it has been a convenient means of attracting widespread popular support for a policy that, unprotected by a cloak of historical myth, might have been more severely attacked.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL.

Redemption by Sainthood

Salvation, by Sholem Asch. Translated by Willa and Edwin Muir. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.50.

THE OUTSTANDING merit of this novel lies in its colorful and often powerful evocation of a Jewish community of a hundred years ago. The customs, ceremonies and everyday struggle for existence of these small tradespeople and handworkers, their naïve faith and messianic dreams, are treated with understanding, sympathy and first-hand knowledge of the subject. Less convincing is the treatment of the central theme, the spiritual drama of Jechiel, who preaches a religion of humility and love. Ritual penance and banal reflections on the impenetrable wisdom of the divinity are rather an easy way to resolve the fundamental torment of this saintly man (or of any saint), which springs from the contradiction between a loving God and a cruel world. Still less convincing are the author's pessimistic ideas about the inevitability of human suffering, and the optimistic fashion in which he speaks of the salvation of the many by the pious few.

Asch was once a leading personality in the fight against Jewish superstition. He still is at his best, not when he attempts to render the ravings of a soul lost in mystical contemplation, but in pages devoted to characters like Reb Bertje, the pious usurer, and to the nightmare of his debtors; or in unforgettable descriptions of rabbinical courts, with their intrigues, false miracles and helpless crowds of ignorant followers. Echoes of his former militancy still speak out in sentences like "Poverty and hardship are the fertile seeds of faith," but Asch seems to have forgotten that every plant has the capacity of reproducing and perpetuating its own seeds, or at least he wants us to believe that the Hassidic variety of faith is a sufficient compensation for human misery. After having been one of the few writers who brought Yiddish literature to the general European level, Asch seems now to be carried away by those currents of modern fiction that attempt to drown real life in the mystical fog of the Life Ineffable.

NORBERT GUTERMAN.

Handsome Is

Skin Deep, by M. C. Phillips. New York: The Vanguard Press. 272 pages. $2.

OUR MOTHERS' attempts at self-beautification were usually confined to wire rats and curl papers and a dab of powder on the nose. Most of them were too busy to indulge in a nightly ritual before their mirrors. Today the average woman has more free time, and she is far more conscious of herself. Her desire for permanent youth has made her an easy prey for the cosmetic manufacturers, whose business now grosses annually about $240,000,000, while the annual expenditure for services as well as products has been estimated at one billion dollars. It is time now to ask whether these billions of dollars' worth of cosmetics have made women more beautiful and alluring to men, as guaranteed, whether they have been marketed at a fair price and, most vital question of all, whether they have been free from harmful effects. These are the questions that M. C. Phillips of Consumers' Research sets out to answer in "Skin Deep." All categories of products, from simple talcum powders and soaps to hair dyes, depilatories and reducing nostrums, are covered. Laboratory data are given showing the ingredients contained in some of the most widely advertised products, and medical opinions are quoted as to the effect these chemicals have on the body. The cases of injury from certain eyelash dyes, depilatories and reducing potions are recited in detail.

A good part of the author's evidence is based on investigations made by the American Medical Association and by several state boards of health, and many of her conclusions appeal to me as sound common sense. I could wish, however,

Shall We "Plow Under" Every Third Hospital Bed?

What is the best way of making adequate medical service available at a reasonable cost—"socialized medicine" or professional control? READ AND DECIDE FOR YOURSELF:

THE COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE
by I. S. FALK, C. RUFUS REMEM, and MARTHA D. RING $4.00

THE ABILITY TO PAY FOR MEDICAL CARE
by LOUIS S. REED $2.00

THE INCOMES OF PHYSICIANS
by MAURICE LEVEN $2.00

MEDICAL CARE for the AMERICAN PEOPLE:
THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE. $1.50

These books are representative titles in a series of twenty-eight studies made by the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. Write for a complete list.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
5750 ELLIS AVENUE CHICAGO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jewish
FRONTIER

15c A COPY $1.50 A YEAR

is founded on the conviction that workers and intellectuals are stirred by a new-born consciousness of Jewish obligations to imminent social and economic changes.

JEWISH FRONTIER HAS FEATURED:

Jew-Baiting and the New Masses
Much Ado about Biro-Bidjan
Economics of Anti-Semitism
Folklorist on Jewish Music
Myth of Arab Exploitation
Revisionists and Laborites
Labor Front in Palestine
East Side in Fresco
Jews Without Jobs
Soviet Nationalism
Drift to the Left

Lucienne Bloch — C. Hartley Grattan
Babette Deutsch — Charles Reznikoff
Horace Gregory — John Cournos
Paul Rosenfeld — Louis Adamic
I. M. Rubinow — Clara G. Stillman
Maurice Samuel — William Zukerman

FEBRUARY NUMBER ON NEWSSTANDS
SUBSCRIPTIONS: 1225 BROADWAY, N. Y. C.

Discovered and Appreciated

Two advertisements for The New Republic's mail order book service, printed to inform our readers of the changed address, brought us new friends and orders with gratifying comments from customers who know us.

CHICAGO, Illinois
"Your advertisement in the January 16 issue of The New Republic leads me to believe that you are my salvation."

LARAMIE, Wyoming
"Again I invoke your uncanny knack of getting orders delivered in incredibly short time."

CONCORD, Massachusetts
"The bookstore may either bill me or send the books C. O. D., as they wish. I have always had the highest confidence in their choices, so will accept whatever they send to cover."

Books of all publishers promptly supplied
Postage free to addresses in the U. S. A.

NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th Street ELdorado 5-4000

that she were more scrupulous about balancing and comparing medical opinion. Her tone is too much that of a small girl who is taunting the bad boy across the fence, and her approach is not quite that of a disinterested scientist. Any reader can see that a few of her statements are open to question. She quotes, for instance, a contributor to The British Medical Journal, who has said that mineral oil has produced cancer in rodents. On the basis of this isolated opinion, concerning so debatable a subject, she advises against the use of cleansing creams instead of soap and water.

In general, the scientific accuracy of the book will have to be passed on by dermatologists rather than lay reviewers. But I can recommend it as a salutary debunking of an inflated and in many respects a dishonest industry, and as an exposure of a shameful legal situation. Every woman should know that certain types of cosmetics are not without danger in some degree, that the price of many products is out of all proportion to the simple ingredients they contain, and that a sane hygiene of living will do more for the skin than the most tempting preparations. Every woman should know too that the Supreme Court, in passing on the case of a woman who had developed serious thyroid trouble after taking a reducing nostrum, ruled that the Federal Trade Commission was exceeding its authority in trying to protect consumers against false advertising. The Commission's only function is to protect one manufacturer against another—that is, to keep the wolves from fighting among themselves.

DOROTHY DUNBAR BROMLEY.

Where Novels Grow

The Foreground of American Fiction, by Harry Hartwick. New York: American Book Company. 463 pages. $2.50.

THIS STUDY, written by a former staff member of the School of Letters at the University of Iowa, is an attempt to survey the American novel of the past forty years as it reflects the American mind. "Mr. Hartwick's purpose," Harry Hayden Clark says in a brief foreword, "has been to explain the novels of our recent past not as products of any one cultural force, but in relation to their whole social, economic, religious, philosophic and literary environment. . . . He does not interpret the novel solely in terms of an economic class struggle, as many recent critics have tended to do."

Now, the concept of wholeness is an extremely healthy one. Both as an attitude and as a method, it has much to contribute towards an economic and social analysis of literature. However, to interpret the American novel in the light of these multiple forces, it would seem necessary that the author create for the reader his own conception of the whole, so that the resulting analysis, instead of being merely atomic, might have a complete cultural and esthetic significance. This—perhaps because of spatial limitations and many obvious personal confusions—Mr. Hartwick has not done. But through his treatment of four tendencies: naturalism (Crane, Dreiser, Anderson), escapism (Cabell, Hergesheimer), social rebellion (Upton Sinclair, John Dos Passos) and classicism (Henry James, Willa Cather, Edith Wharton), he has recreated the pattern of the literary milieu of the past two-score years. Though Mr. Hartwick is more actively disposed to naturalism than these other critics, his text can be ranked in the company of somewhat similar works by Russell Blankenship, V. F. Calverton and Granville Hicks.

ERIC ESTORICK.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

Isaac Newton: A Biography, by Louis Trenchard More. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 675 pages. $4.50.

SIR David Brewster's "standard" life of Sir Isaac Newton, published in 1855, was written in a deep moral vein, which saw in the "high priest of science" a demigod who erred little and sinned not at all. Dr. More (professor of Physics in the University of Cincinnati, and a brother of Paul Elmer More) will have none of this Victorian adulation, and his exhaustive biography of Newton easily supplants everything thus far written about the great Englishman. Every available source has been consulted, with the result that we not only obtain a clear picture of the intellectual development of Newton but the place this development had in the history of his time. Many facts, either unknown or previously glossed over, reveal an astounding mathematical genius whose deep humility before nature went hand in hand with a childish irritability, oversensitiveness and even arrogance before the world. Nor did Newton's "detachment" prevent him from making the most of his official career as Warden of the Royal Mint, or from indulging in the most petulant fits of temper in his controversies with Flamsteed and Leibnitz.

Dr. More's treatment of these lesser-known facts is exceptionally full and scholarly—as is also his account of Newton's vagaries in the domain of theology and religious chronology. Of particular interest is the final chapter, giving details on Newton's business transactions: here we find the great lawgiver of the cosmos dabbling—to his loss—in the South Sea Bubble, gambling recklessly in stocks and shares, playing the market, and on his death leaving the very comfortable fortune of nearly £32,000. H. W.

The New Orient. Volume I: The Near East. Introduction by James H. Breasted. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 483 pages. $5.

This beautifully bound and illustrated volume of essays is designed to present to Americans a sympathetic survey of the Near East. It contains competent accounts of modern Turkey, Egypt, Arabia, Syria and Palestine. The collaborators are uniformly enthusiastic, as they should be; but the presentation of their material is disappointingly conventional. For example, only casual reference is made to the great role of the motor car and the airplane in post-war development; and in at least one of the chapters the omission of important facts gives a distorted picture. The volume possesses many of the disadvantages of a collaborative effort. A strong editorial hand was needed to eliminate redundancies, to establish perspective, even to assure uniformity of spelling. Persia should certainly have been included in preference to a section on the cultural heritage of the Far East. Better bibliographies would have been useful, and some sort of index would seem to be indispensable.

E. M. E.

Where the Ghetto Ends: Jews in Soviet Russia, by Leon Dennen. New York: Alfred H. King. 254 pages. $2.50.

Mr. Dennen does not give the 100-percent endorsement of Soviet Russia that a sympathizer might wish for, but he makes it clear that nowhere else is there so sincere and determined an effort to solve the Jewish problem, and that nowhere else in the world is it so promisingly near to solution. The attack is threefold: a continuing drive against such anti-Semitism as still finds expression here and there; national liberation of the Jews; and economic transforma-

INTEGRATION OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SOCIAL WORK

requires a professionally trained personnel in both fields.

The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work

offers a graduate curriculum leading to the Master's and Doctor's degrees, for the acquisition of the necessary knowledge and skills.

For information about requirements for admission, scholarships and fellowships, write to

DR. M. J. KARPF, Director

The Graduate School For Jewish Social Work

71 West 47th Street, New York City

THEATRES

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
S. N. BEHRMAN'S play
RAIN FROM HEAVEN
with JANE COWL
and JOHN HALLIDAY
GOLDEN THEATRE, 45th Street, West of Broadway. Evenings, 8:30. Mats. Thurs. and Sat. 2:30.

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
(in association with Charles B. Cochran)
for a limited engagement
ELISABETH BERGNER *in*
ESCAPE ME NEVER
by MARGARET KENNEDY
SHUBERT THEATRE, 44th Street, West of Broadway Evenings, 8:30. Mats. Thurs. and Sat., 2:30

"Mixes Mirth with Mystery . . . .
I enjoyed it . . . and Mr. Gwenn and Mr. Cooper."
—*Robert Garland, World-Telegram.*
LABURNUM GROVE
J. B. PRIESTLEY'S Comedy
with **EDMUND GWENN**
BOOTH Thea., 45th, W. of B'way Evgs. 8:50. Mats. Wed.-Sat. Pop. MAT. WED., 50c, $1.50 plus tax EXTRA MAT. LINCOLN'S B'DAY.

MOTION PICTURES

FILM & PHOTO LEAGUE *presents*
Phantom President with Geo. M. Cohan and Jimmy Durante | **Stark Love** A Documentary Picture of Tennessee Mountaineers
Saturday, FEBRUARY 16, 1935
TWO SHOWINGS—PROMPTLY AT 7 and 9:30 P. M.
NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
66 West 12th St. New York City
Tickets, 50c. *Available at*: Mayfair Bookshop, 1 E. 47th St.; Workers' Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St.; Film and Photo League, 31 E. 21st St.; Columbia Bookstore, Columbia University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the Jew by means of settling him on the land, in autonomous regions where he can turn from his liquidated bourgeois callings to agriculture and industry. It is an inspiring record. By depending more upon anecdotes and on-the-spot observation than on statistics, Mr. Dennen, who has a real narrative talent, succeeds in giving it freshness and immediate interest. I. S.

Intrepid Bird, by Mary Britton Miller. New York: The Macmillan Company. 81 pages. $1.50.

This is sensitive poetry with an even tone of seriousness. The mysticism that prevails throughout is genuine and not a trick of cryptic phrase, although somewhat in the Emily Dickinson tradition in the shorter poems. Miss Miller has a lyrical gift that gives delight and occasional sharpness to her treatment of spring, birds, flowers, and a moving charm to a piece called "Bright Witness." There is a positive quality, more grave, of spiritual questioning, resulting in several poems of point and value, "Parturition," "The Sparrows, IV," "The Infidel." Her verse is made frequently by means of an image stated and expanded. Some of these poems are marred by failure to carry through with the original sense. There is an earnest talent at work here; but the use of too many easy terms—"wings of ecstasy," "set determination," "urgent haste," etc.—deprives Miss Miller's poems of the real interest their raptness needs. They are poems of fortitude and inner crisis. Such writing requires verbal as well as spiritual revelation. H. F.

Contributors

GEORGE S. COUNTS, who has been professor of Education at Teachers' College, Columbia University, since 1927, has published a number of volumes on various aspects of education. His latest book is "The Social Foundation of Education."

HODDING CARTER is editor and publisher of The Daily Courier of Hammond, Louisiana, and has observed and reported the political career of Huey Long for several years.

GERALD L. K. SMITH is a former minister who, as will be seen from his article, has become one of the staunchest supporters of Huey Long. He writes that his article is the first he ever submitted to any magazine.

MARYA ZATURENSKA (Mrs. Horace Gregory) was born in Kiev, Russia, coming to this country at the age of eight. She is the author of "Threshold and Hearth," a book of verse published last fall by Macmillan.

HORACE TAYLOR is a member of the Economics department of Columbia University. The second volume of his college textbook, "Contemporary Problems in the United States," has just been issued by Harcourt, Brace.

HERMAN SIMPSON was formerly an editor of The New York Call. He was a contributor to the symposium "Recovery Through Revolution."

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL is president of the Foreign Policy Association and is the author of many books on international affairs. He was chairman of the Commission on Cuban Affairs which was organized at the request of the Cuban government

MAURITZ A. HALLGREN is the author of "Seeds of Revolt," and is now working on a study of Franklin D. Roosevelt's political and economic philosophy.

NORBERT GUTERMAN is a French writer and critic now living in New York.

DOROTHY DUNBAR BROMLEY is the author of "Birth Control, Its Use and Misuse," recently published by Harpers.

ERIC ESTORICK contributes critical reviews to various magazines.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Harold Ward, Edward Meade Earle, Isidor Schneider and Hildegarde Flanner.

DINNER—DISCUSSION

DRAMA AND MUSIC IN THE SOVIET UNION (Illustrated)

PROF. H. W. L. DANA — Recently returned from the Soviet Union

ASHLEY PETTIS — Pianist and music critic

DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS:

Michael Blankfort, Emma Haddell, Sidney Ross, Lee Simonson, Oliver M. Sayler

ALDINE CLUB 200 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. 6:30 P. M.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1935

Reservation: $1.50

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY, 80 E. 11th Street (GR. 5-9879) N. Y. C.

LECTURES

COOPER UNION
Dept. of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—At 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, February 15th
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"Tactitus and Suetonius Reveal the Nature of Dictatorship."

Sunday, February 17th
PROF. EDWARD G. SPAULDING
"How to Relate Knowledge of Philosophy to Modern Life."

Tuesday, February 19th
PROFESSOR LYMAN BRYSON
"Security in a Planned Economy."

GRAMOPHONE RECORDS

MUSIC LOVERS— 100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc. MAIL ORDERS, CATALOGUE. THE GRAMOPHONE SHOP, Inc., 18 E. 48th St., New York City.

GENERAL

WHY BE DISCONTENTED? Or defeated by environment? Or depressed by loneliness? Write Box 434, Spokane, Washington. Enclose postage.

MEETING

William Randolph
HEARST:
Press Agent of American Fascism
A Protest Meeting; Speakers:
BROADUS MITCHELL — *of Johns Hopkins University*
JAMES CASEY — *Mg. Ed. Daily Worker*
Rabbi BENJAMIN GOLDSTEIN — *Am. League Against War and Fascism*
JAMES WECHSLER — *Ed. Columbia Spectator*
FEBRUARY 15—8:30 p. m.
New School for Social Research, 66 W. 12th St.
PRESS LEAGUE Admission, 50c

BOOK

Birth Control
SEND ONLY 10c
For valuable book, "The Safe Period: The NATURAL Method of Birth Control," by Dr. W. J. Robinson, world-famous authority. Order at once while supply lasts, at unusually low price of only 10 cents.
EUGENICS PUB. CO.,
317 E. 34 St., N. Y. C., Dept. SF58.

ORANGES FOR SALE

Oranges, sweet, juicy, sun-ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, $3.50 bushel basket. Tangerines, $3.75; Grapefruit, $3.00. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Fla.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

PERSONS (MEN, WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN) interested in membership in a society for the payment of medical, hospital and nursing costs in the event of illness are invited to communicate with Box 882, The New Republic.
Benefits are planned to include doctors' bills, hospitalization, nursing care, confinement expenses, etc.

MAGAZINE

The
Westminster Magazine
announces
An All-Southern Issue:

The Southern Novel Since 1917 — MARISTAN CHAPMAN
Present-Day Southern Poets — JOHN GOULD FLETCHER
Tactics in Tennessee — W. S. KNICKERBOCKER
Short Stories — PHILIP LIGHTFOOT SCRUGGS *and* CAROLINE GORDON
Poetry — JOHN PEALE BISHOP, JOHN GOULD FLETCHER, DONALD DAVIDSON, GENE DE BULLET *and* RANDALL JARRELL
Edited by Robert England
25c a copy; $1 a year
OGLETHORPE UNIVERSITY
OGLETHORPE GEORGIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED